THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH *and the* CIVIL WAR

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET

The Methodist Episcopal Church and the Civil War

By

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET, Ph. D.

Assistant Professor of History, Ohio Wesleyan University.

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

CINCINNATI:
METHODIST BOOK CONCERN PRESS

To My Wife,
Louise Neill Sweet.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/methodistepiscop00swee_1

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Introduction, By Professor R. T. Stevenson, Ph. D.	9
I.	The Status of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the Opening of the War,	15
II.	The Church on the Border,	47
III.	The Church in the New England and Atlantic States,	63
IV.	The Church in the Central and Northwestern States,	80
V.	Missions of the Church in the South During the War,	96
VI.	Methodist Periodicals,	111
VII.	Methodist Chaplains in the Union Armies,	133
VIII.	The War Bishops,	142
IX.	Methodist Co-operation with Interdenominational Organizations,	161
X.	Bibliography,	177

APPENDIX.

PAGE

A. Names of Methodist Chaplains, - - 189

B. Names of Methodist Preachers Who Were Delegates of the U. S. Christian Commission, - - - - - - - 197

C. Letter to Jefferson Davis by a Confederate Officer, Concerning Bishop Ames, - 208

D. Outline of Bishop Simpson's Lecture on "Our Country;" Bishop Simpson's Funeral Oration Over the Body of Lincoln, - 211

E. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Relation to the War, - - - - 219

F. Tabulated List of Memorials Presented to the General Conference of 1860, For and Against Changing the Rule on Slavery, 226

PREFACE

This study of the Methodist Episcopal Church in its relation to the Civil War was begun several years ago, and was continued and is brought to its present form as a Doctor's Thesis at the University of Pennsylvania. And I wish in the very beginning to acknowledge the advice and assistance I have received, particularly from Professor H. V. Ames, of the University of Pennsylvania, and also from Professor R. T. Stevenson, of the Ohio Wesleyan University, who has written the Introduction.

The study deals with facts alone, and I have tried to be absolutely fair to all parties. Most of the material which I have had to use is of controversial character, and it was not always easy to come to a conclusion as to the exact facts, and it is not at all to be wondered at if I have made mistakes in some of my conclusions; but while I admit possible mistakes, I can still lay claim to a clear conscience, as far as fairness is concerned. In many places the account is not as readable as I should have liked to have made it, and where such is the case I have no excuse to offer except that in my desire to be fair I have crowded down all feeling and any attempt at a glorification of the Church, the absence of which has perhaps made the narrative seem more prosaic.

The material I have used has been practically untouched by the regular historian. My peculiar sources have been such as the Church periodicals, Minutes of the General Conferences and the several Annual Conferences, Church records, minutes of preachers' meetings, histories of individual Churches, and biographies

of prominent Church officials, such as the bishops, the general secretaries of the various Church societies, and the private papers of others intimately connected with the Church and its activities during the war.

In making this study it was not my object to glorify the Methodist Episcopal Church because of the important part she took in the Civil War, but it was to tell in a scientific manner just what the Methodist Episcopal Church, taken as a typical example of the other Churches, did in aiding the Federal Government to bring to a successful close the War of the Rebellion. The thesis of this study is to show the importance of the Churches as an aid to the Government during the Civil War.

I also entertain the hope that this attempt to tell the story of the relation of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Civil War may prove of some interest and value to those who love the Church of their fathers.

Delaware, Ohio, July 1, 1912. W. W. S.

INTRODUCTION

THE writer of the following thesis set for himself a serious task. So far as I know it has not been attempted by any one else. The connection between Church and State in America is intimate and vital. It is not legal. The Constitution prohibits any such interdependence as European history so fully illustrated for centuries.

Yet neither can do without the other. According to Professor Seeley, of Cambridge University, religion is the great State-making principle. Its whole genius tends to order, to adjustment of social relations, to support of good government, to peace. To secure these it may even become the blesser of battlefields. At least it achieved this character in the past.

The Methodist Episcopal Church entered upon its unparalleled career of expansion with the birth of the American Republic. Its first two bishops, Coke and Asbury, were the earliest ecclesiastical officials to tender to the first President of the American Union the unanimous support of their Church immediately upon its organization. They asked no favors of money or legal support, only that they might procure through their evangel a high and loyal devotion to the lofty purpose which animated the fathers of the Republic—that of planting on the Western Continent a new and abiding government of, by, and for the people. That such an expending democracy and such an ecclesiastical system should have developed deep sympathy with each other's aim is not to be reckoned strange. In the Middle Ages State and Church were wedded in indissoluble bonds, but it was not to be so in the nineteenth century. It was reserved for the Mississippi Valley to illustrate the

intermingling of a free faith and a mighty nationalism; the State giving freedom to the Church, and the Church giving to the State moral character.

Long years after the visit of the bishops to the President a distinguished successor of Coke and Asbury headed a committee under appointment by the General Conference of 1864 to go to Washington and to convey to Abraham Lincoln assurances of loyalty to the cause of the Union. It was a time of profound anxiety, and the reply of the President showed his appreciation of what the committee brought to him. His words, carefully written out before their arrival after he had read their statement laid before him by one of their number, included the famous tribute to the Methodist Episcopal Church, which "sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospital, and more prayers to heaven than any," because of its greater size. What the President felt was true of the relation between the State and the Church he expressed in the immortal benediction, his closing word to the committee: "God bless the Methodist Church—bless all the Churches—and blessed be God, who in this our great trial giveth us the Churches."

No one can doubt, with such a statement as the above from this master of men and words, the propriety of the effort of the writer of this thesis to discover the place and to measure the power and to characterize the quality of the services rendered the Union by the Church he has selected for illustration of his proposition. It is now far enough removed from the terrific struggle for men to use scientific rather than passionate animus to set forth the work of the dead. The spirit and method of proceedure used by Mr. Sweet are not those of a laudator, but of the scientific analyst, as becomes the accomplishment of the doctorate of philosophy degree for which he offers this in the University of Pennsylvania. In no sense is he a special pleader. He

has not suffered his natural affection for the Church of his fathers to queer his judgment. Nor has he allowed the substitution of any graces of style for careful research and of accurate, even bald and unadorned statement of facts. To sacrifice otherwise pardonable enthusiasm for the sake of stoic impartiality is no mean use of the altar of scholarship. He has spared no pains to reach original material in unearthing, when possible, unpublished private and official documents. His bibliography reveals his obligations.

A swift survey will indicate his aim and its results. That one may state properly the position of the Methodist Episcopal Church during the War of the Rebellion, he must pick up the thread of history farther back in time. Great institutions never step up to a fixed date with convictions duly marked for delivery, unchanged from start to destination. No cross section at any one date satisfies the historian. So the author handles with impartial statement the developing attitude of the Church towards slavery. This was fundamentally obligatory, as involved in the development of both State and Church. What the Church thought of the labor system of a giant section of the Nation was as important to set forth as the thought of the State, for the same men who worked the enginery of strife were those who were trained in supplication. On both sides gallant soldiers were true Christians. A general view of the numerical strength of the Church and its distribution in the States demanded analysis. The first chapter is taken up with this duty.

In the second chapter we find an impartial résumé of the work of the Church in the Border States. Fairly to state the case upon the soil where for decades and on into the years of strife members of the Church held differing views of the political situation is not without difficulty, yet even here the spirit of impartiality is manifest. In the third chapter the task is easier, for

in New England the wind blew in the main all one way, and nearly so also in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. In order in the following chapter is related the position of the membership of the Church in the central and northwest sections of the Nation. With the narration of the work of the General Conference of 1864 the fourth chapter is brought to an end.

In chapter five the writer enters what would have been forty years ago a mine, with its narrow alleys filled with mephitic gases, a peril to any but the miner carrying a Davy lamp, his only safety against explosion; now, in the better air of cooler and unprejudiced reflection, one can walk without a safety lamp pinned to his brow. At any rate the historian content with only the truth is safe. With that alone the coming age will be satisfied. Less frankness would have led the writer to stop with an earlier date, but such a spirit never gets the world of scholarship along. Having entered upon the discussion, it must get on to the end. It is enough to say that, as war has always interfered with the normal order of human society, it could not be expected suddenly to change the conviction of the Church as to its duty to go to its membership or sympathizers across the Ohio River. To take up work either among the negroes in the South or among the whites where it was welcomed, and in any case where such work would not have been done had not the Methodist Episcopal Church attempted to do it, and in fields where the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had been crippled by the war, was the call of high duty as it appeared to our fathers. The justification of it all was felt in later years by such men as Bishop Attieus G. Haygood, of Georgia. In saying this there is not any purpose to justify any hot words or unfraternal acts which followed the final surrender of the Southern army. Later wisdom will see how to prevent duplication of work wherever earlier impulse may have erred. But this is merely by way of

granting that Mr. Sweet had nothing else to do but to reeite the faets, as he has done.

It is past belief that so aetive a body of men should not have given expression to their eonvictions in the Chureh papers. Mr. Sweet has made an interesting ehapter upon the Chureh Press. In sueh papers as *Zion's Herald,* published in Boston, there was the utmost abandon of patriotie fervor. And with equal devotion we find the *Western Christian Advocate,* in Cincinnati, on the border, uttering no doubtful word. On the first page of his editorial work Dr. Calvin Kingsley wrote thus, on the date of June 5, 1861: "What is the use of writing upon anything else? It will not be read; or if read, not remembered or thought of. The subjeet engrosses all thought, all interest. We read about it, we talk about it; we dream about it; we preaeh about it; we pray about it." After this fashion he mirrored the views of seores of others.

Akin to this was the support of sueh brilliant men as the Rev. Dr. John MeClintoek, in Paris, where he used the press and any other available ageney to quiet the Freneh Government when it was striving to aid the Southern Confederaey.

An interesting presentation of the faithfulness of the Methodist army ehaplains fills the next ehapter. No little plaee was theirs. They were a truly heroie class of men. In the list were men like Granville Moody, of Ohio; Evan Stevenson, of Indiana; and W. H. Gilder, of New York. When we reach the story of the War Bishops, such men as Matthew Simpson and E. R. Ames rise at call, whose devotion and tremendous foree proved a huge asset in favor of the Union.

Finally a chapter is devoted to all the phases of eooperation with other Churches, in which the Government was made to feel that it had at call every form of might which the different denominations could put at the disposal of the struggling Nation. The Christian Sanitary

Commission, the Bible Society, the Freedmen's Aid Societies, were solid proof that up to their ability the members of the Churches were using both arms of power, the human and the divine, for the sustenance of the National life. In fine, never in history have the Churches of a land so fully flung themselves into a great conflict as during the dreadful-glorious years of 1861-1865, when the American people issued from strife a united Nation. A thousand things were said and done which left sorry memories; yet as time goes on and exercises its soothing agencies, the children of the soldiers will more and more come to see eye to eye and unite in thanking God that His will prevailed and the peaceful program of the long ages of a great Nation suffered only from one sharp collision between men of heroic mold but of differing views, now and henceforth to join in furthering the cause of liberty through the service of a "Free Church in a Free State."

R. T. Stevenson.

Ohio Wesleyan University,
Delaware, Ohio, June 19, 1912.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND THE CIVIL WAR.

CHAPTER I.

The Status of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the Opening of the War.

To get an understanding of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the opening of the Civil War it will be necessary to review the contest over slavery which took place within the Church, and which finally resulted in the great schism of 1844.

The Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in Baltimore in the year 1784, and at this time the General Rules, which had been prepared by Mr. Wesley in 1739 for the English Societies, were adopted, among them being one forbidding "the buying or selling the bodies and souls of men, women, or children, with an intention to enslave them."[1] This organizing Conference, besides adopting this rule forbidding slavery within the Church, gave attention also to the extirpation of the whole system. Question Forty-two of the Minutes reads, "What methods can we take to extirpate slavery?"[2] This question is then answered by a sweeping indictment against the whole system, which is followed by six special rules designed completely to destroy slavery within the Church. The summary of these rules is as follows: (1) Every slave-holding member, within twelve months

[1] "Anti-Slavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church," Matlack, p. 58.

[2] Discipline, 1784 (reprint), pp. 14, 15.

is required to execute a deed of manumission, gradually giving his slaves their freedom. (2) All infants who were born after these rules went into force were to have immediate freedom. (3) Members who chose not to comply were allowed to withdraw within twelve months. (4) The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was to be denied to all such thenceforward. (5) No slave-holders were to be admitted thereafter to Church membership. (6) Any member who bought, sold, or gave slaves away, except on purpose to free them, were immediately to be expelled.[3]

Slavery had evidently found its way into the Methodist societies during the Revolution, and very probably without the knowledge of either Mr. Wesley or his assistant in America, Mr. Francis Asbury. One writer points out that almost every preacher received into the ministry during the Revolution was from the South, and that all the Conferences from 1776 to 1787 were held in what were afterwards the Slave States. From 1777 to 1783 there was not one appointment north of some parts of New Jersey, and out of a membership of about fourteen thousand in 1783 only about two thousand resided in what were afterwards known as Free States.[4]

For a number of years the rules adopted in the Conference of 1784 remained in force and were quite largely complied with. A Methodist residing in the South from 1785 to 1826 writes that he never knew of but one instance where they were neglected by a member, and that was his next-door neighbor, at whose house the presiding elder once called on business and, on being asked to remain for dinner, replied, "I never eat a meal in a Methodist slave-holder's house."[5] It

[3] Matlack, p. 59.

[4] "The Methodist Episcopal Church and Slavery," De Vinné, pp. 11-13.

[5] *Zion's Watchman*, April 8, 1838. Quoted in Matlack, pp. 59, 60.

seems that the preachers, for a few years after these rules were passed, preached boldly against slave-holding, and not a few Methodist slave-holders liberated their slaves.[6] But these rules also met with immediate opposition in many sections of the South. Bishop Asbury in his Journal says, "At the Virginia Conference for 1785 several petitions were presented by some of the principal members, urging the suspension of the rules."

This bold position, taken by the Church at its beginning, began to be receded from, however, by 1786, for in the Discipline of that year Methodists are forbidden to buy and sell slaves, but nothing is said about slave-holding, thus permitting it by inference, at least.[7] In 1792 another receding step is taken by omitting the law passed in 1786, retaining only the prohibition against slavery in the General Rules.[8]

In 1796, however, the Church's position in opposition to slavery was again strengthened by a note prepared by the bishops and appended to the General Rules. This note begins with the words, "The buying and selling the souls of men . . . is a complicated crime."[9] This year also a new section "Of Slavery" was added, and the attempt to drive slavery from the Church was renewed, by the adoption of four new rules looking to that end.

In 1800 two more rules were added. These rules were not nearly so stringent as those of 1784, for only Church officials were required to emancipate their slaves, and preachers who became slave-holders were re-

[6] Matlack, p. 60. Also "Barratt's Chapel and Methodism," by Hon. Norris S. Barratt, pp. 41, 42.

In January, 1796, Andrew Barratt, "being persuaded that liberty is the natural birthright of all mankind and keeping any in perpetual slavery is contrary to the injunctions of Christ," for which reason he "did manumit and set absolutely free all his Negroes, thirteen in all, so that henceforth they shall be deemed, adjudged and taken as free people."—*Quoted from Deed Book H, vol. 2, p. 264, Dover, Del.*

[7] Matlack, p. 60.

[8] *Ibid*, p. 62.

[9] Discipline, 1796, pp. 169-171.

quired to withdraw from the ministry or else emancipate their slaves. These rules, also, by inference allow members to hold slaves, but they must not buy or sell them.[10]

The General Conference of 1800 authorized an "Address to all their brethren and friends in the United States," calling special attention to slavery, which was signed by the three bishops: Coke, Asbury, and Whatcoat, and also by three prominent ministers: Ezekiel Cooper, William McKendree, and Jesse Lee. This address calls slavery "the great National evil" and states that "We therefore, determined at last to raise up all our influence in order to hasten to the utmost in our power the universal extirpation of this crying sin."[11]

From 1800 to 1860 the various changes made in the Discipline with reference to slavery are as follows: In 1804 the question as to the extirpation of slavery was changed from "What regulations shall be made for the extirpation of the crying evil of African slavery?" to "What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?" In this year also slave-selling is allowed to Church members, but it was to be under the supervision of a committee of the male members of the society, appointed by the minister. This Conference further receded from the former strong anti-slavery position of the Conferences of 1784, 1796, and 1800 by exempting all members in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee from all the rules respecting slavery. In the Discipline of this year also we find this: "Let your preachers from time to time, . . . admonish and exhort all slaves to render due respect and obedience to the commands and interests of their respective members."[12]

The Discipline of 1808 contains only three paragraphs relating to slavery: one referring to official members being slave-holders, and another to slave-holding

[10] Matlack, p. 64.
[11] *Ibid*, p. 65.
[12] Discipline, 1804, pp. 215, 216.

preachers, and a new provision allowing the Annual Conferences to regulate the traffic in slaves within their own territory. The other provisions contained in the Discipline of 1804 relating to slavery were left out. In 1820 the paragraph allowing Annual Conferences to regulate the slave traffic of the members was rescinded. In 1824 the section on slavery was amended for the last time until 1860.[13] A summary of the sections of the Discipline of that year (1824) bearing on slavery is as follows: (1) The Church is convinced of the great evil of slavery, and slave-holders are prohibited from holding official positions in the Church, where the State laws will admit emancipation. (2) A minister who becomes a slave-holder must either cease to be a minister or emancipate his slaves. (3) The preachers are to see that the slaves are given religious instruction. (4) Colored preachers and official members are to have the same rights as others in the District and Quarterly Conferences. (5) Annual Conferences are given the privilege of employing colored preachers.[14]

When the anti-slavery agitation fathered by Garrison began, in the early thirties,[15] it met a considerable response in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and a number of Methodist anti-slavery societies were formed. In June, 1835, the New England Methodist ministers organized an anti-slavery society, and also in the same year another society was organized by the ministers of the New Hampshire Conference. During this year one of the strong anti-slavery members of the last named Conference sent Mr. Garrison's paper, *The Liberator,* free of charge for six months to all ministers of his Conference,[16] and Mr. Garrison himself commended the

[13] Matlack, p. 71.
[14] Matlack, pp. 71, 72.
[15] The American Anti-Slavery Society was organized in Philadelphia, December, 1833. "Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America," Wilson, chap. xviii.
[16] Matlack, pp. 85-87.

eourage of the Methodists of Boston for their brave stand on the question of slavery.[17]

Early Methodist anti-slavery sentiment seemed to be eonfined, however, largely to New England, while many of the most influential men in the Church were opposed to abolition.[18] In September, 1835, a pastoral letter from Bishops Hedding and Emory was addressed to the New England and New Hampshire Conferenees, in whieh they state, "We have found no sueh exeitement with any of them [Conferenees] exeept yours," and they regard the general agitation as a "deep politieal game," in which the ministers ought not to be drawn. They further urge the "members and friends everywhere" to diseountenanee all ministers from agitating the subjeet "from the pulpit or otherwise."[19]

In the General Conferenee of 1836, which met at Cincinnati, eonsiderable exeitement was caused by two members of that body, from the New Hampshire Conferenee, attending a meeting of the Cineinnati Anti-Slavery Soeiety, where eaeh made a short address. A resolution was introdueed into the Conference eondemning their action, whieh passed by 122 yeas to only 11 nays. Another resolution was passed at the same time, eondemning "Modern abolitionism, and wholly diselaiming any right, wish, or intention to interfere in the eivil and politieal relation between master and slave as it exists in the slave-holding States of the Union." This resolution passed by about the same vote as the former—120 yeas to 14 nays.[20] This vote shows how weak was the anti-slavery sentiment in the Chureh at this time.

In this same year the pastoral letter, published by the authority of the General Conferenee and signed by all the bishops, exhorts all "to abstain from all abolition movements and associations and to refrain from

[17] "National Sermons," Haven. Introduction, p. vii.
[18] Matlack, pp. 87-89. [19] Matlack, p. 90. [20] *Ibid,* pp. 93-102.

patronizing any of their publications." During the next few years following we find Southern Conferences passing resolutions declaring slavery a domestic and civil institution, and not a proper subject of Church interference. In 1837 the Georgia Conference declared slavery not a moral wrong, and an institution of which the Church has nothing to do. In 1838 the South Carolina Conference passed similar resolutions.[21]

Between the General Conferences of 1836 and 1840 considerable trouble was experienced in several of the Annual Conferences over the question of abolition. In a number of cases ministers were tried for being abolitionists, and some young men were refused ministerial orders because of their abolition sentiment.[22] The Philadelphia Conference, for instance, from 1837 for ten years asked each candidate for admission into the Conference, "Are you an abolitionist?" and unless this question was answered in the negative they were not received.[23] Among the Conferences before whom abolition ministers were brought for trial were the Pittsburgh, Erie, and New York.

This harsh treatment of the abolitionists by the Church, instead of crushing the movement, tended to increase it. A number of anti-slavery papers came into existence, edited by Methodist ministers, among them being *The Wesleyan Journal,* published in Hallowell, Maine; *The American Wesleyan Observer,* edited by Revs. Orange Scott and J. Hall, of Lowell, Mass.; and *The Zion's Watchman,* edited by Rev. LaRoy Sunderland and published in New York. This latter paper was the most important and influential of the Methodist anti-slavery journals. During these years also several Methodist anti-slavery conventions were held. Such a convention was held in August, 1837, in the Methodist Church of Cazenovia, N. Y., and later in the same month

[21] Matlack, p. 104. [22] *Ibid,* pp. 112-120.
[23] Minutes Philadelphia Conference, 1837-1850.

another convention, made up of Methodist laymen, met in New York Mills, which adopted very radical abolition resolutions,[24] and still another such convention assembled at Lynn, Mass., in October of that year. In 1838 two large conventions were held: one on May 2d and 3d at Utica, N. Y., and another on November 21st and 22d at Lowell, Mass.[25].

By 1840 anti-slavery sentiment seemed to have considerably increased within the Church, especially among the laymen. The Annual Conferences just prior to the General Conference of 1840 were asked to vote upon the proposition, which originated with the New England Conference, proposing to change the General Rule on slavery so that it should forbid "the buying or selling, or holding men, women, or children as slaves, or giving them away except on purpose to free them."[26] While this was voted down by large majorities in the Conferences outside of New England, yet the vote showed some increase in abolition sentiment in some of the Northern Conferences. Four Conferences adopted memorials asking anti-slavery action to be taken by the coming General Conference, which contained the names of over one thousand private members and over five hundred ministers. A memorial from New York City contained nearly twelve hundred names.[27]

The continued persecution of abolitionists within the Church and the failure of the General Conference of 1840 to take any advanced anti-slavery action gave rise to the secession from the Church of a considerable number of dissatisfied persons. In Ohio, New York, and Michigan, as early as 1839, a number of small societies withdrew from the Church and organized independent congregations. On May 31, 1843, a convention of the dissatisfied anti-slavery Methodists was called at Utica, N. Y., and there the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Amer-

[24] Matlack, p. 125.
[25] *Ibid,* pp. 126, 127.
[26] *Ibid,* p. 133.
[27] *Ibid,* pp. 133, 134.

ica was organized.[28] Eighteen months after its organization the membership of this new anti-slavery Church was reported as fifteen thousand.

From the years 1840 to 1844 the anti-slavery sentiment in the Methodist Episcopal Church greatly increased. The incident which was the direct cause of the increase of this sentiment was the action of a Maryland pro-slavery convention which met in the winter of 1841-42. This convention passed resolutions asking the Legislature of the State to pass a law which would result in either driving the free Negroes from the State or reduce them to bondage. This action aroused Methodists all over the North, because many of the free Negroes of Maryland were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church.[29]

In an editorial of the *Christian Advocate and Journal,* which before had been silent on the question of slavery, the editor says, "The questions which we were told it was dangerous to discuss are not forced upon us by those who conjured us to be silent . . . and with the blessing of God, we will not discuss them to the heart's content of the slave-holders' convention."[30] Large Methodist anti-slavery conventions were held, especially in New England, protesting against this pro-slavery action in Maryland, and there was considerable talk of "separation from the South."[31] This discussion and agitation was continued in all the Church papers, both North and South, and in the various Conferences and conventions until the convening of the General Conference of 1844, when the great anti-slavery crisis was reached.

---

[28] "History of the Christian Church," Hurst, vol. ii, p. 894.

[29] "The Great Secession," Elliott, pp. 237, 238.

[30] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Jan., 1842. The notice of this subject in the *Christian Advocate* created considerable alarm in the South, and predictions were made, if it continued to take part in the discussion of slavery, the paper would not circulate in the South. (Elliott, p. 238.)

[31] Matlack, pp. 151, 152.

The General Conference met in New York on May 1, 1844. The question of slavery came up early in the session, in connection with an appeal of a member of the Baltimore Conference, who had been suspended from his ministerial standing for refusing to manumit certain slaves which had come into his possession through marriage. After a discussion which covered five days the General Conference sustained the action of the Baltimore Conference by a vote of 117 to 56.[32]

The great discussion over slavery, however, came up in connection with the Report of the Committee on Episcopacy on May 21st. Bishop James O. Andrew, of Georgia, had a slave girl left him by an old lady of Augusta, Ga., on condition that he should liberate her and send her to Liberia, with her consent. But on reaching the required age the girl refused to go to Liberia, and remained legally the property of Bishop Andrew. He also had inherited from his first wife a slave boy, which he could not free, and on his second marriage he married a lady who had inherited slaves from a former husband's estate.[33]

On the report of the Committee on Episcopacy a resolution was offered requesting Bishop Andrew to resign his office as a bishop. After considerable discussion, the next day a substitute motion for the above resolution was offered, stating "that it is the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment remains." The discussion of this substitute motion lasted ten days, and finally on June 1st the substitute was carried by a vote of 110 yeas to 68 nays.[34]

---

[32] Methodist Church Property Case, pp. 57-59.

[33] *Ibid.* pp. 61, 62 for Bishop Andrew's letter explaining his connection with slavery. Also "Life and Letters of Bishop Andrew," G. G. Smith, chap. ix, pp. 336-385.

[34] Methodist Church Property Case, pp. 63-66. Also Report of Debates in the General Conference of 1844, pp. 188-191. This source gives the vote as 111 to 69.

Status at the Opening of the War.

On June 3d a series of resolutions was offered by Dr. Capers, of South Carolina, providing for a separation of the Church, North and South, and these resolutions were referred to a special committee of nine, which was to report as soon as possible. On June 5th a declaration of the delegates of the Conferences in the slaveholding States, signed by fifty-two names, was presented, which declared "that the continued agitation of the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church; the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference; and especially the extra judicial proceedings against Bishop Andrew . . . must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of this General Conference inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding States."[35]

On June 8th the special committee of nine, to whom had been referred all matters relating to the separation of the Church, reported in a series of eleven resolutions. These resolutions provided for the separation of the Church, in the slave-holding States, from the Church in the North, "should the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection."[36] The General Conference adjourned June 10th.

On the morning immediately after the adjournment the Southern delegates met in New York City and agreed to call a convention of the Southern Churches, to meet at Louisville, Ky., on the first day of May of the following year, 1845. These delegates drew up an address to the ministers and members in the Southern States and Territories, stating in part "that the various action of the majority of the General Conference at its recent session, on the subject of slavery and abolition, has been

[35] *Ibid*, p. 68.

[36] Report of Debates in the General Conference, 1844, pp. 217-219. Also Methodist Church Property Case, pp. 88-90; also Matlack, pp. 175, 176.

such as to render it necessary, in the judgment of those addressing you, to call attention to the proscription and disability under which the Southern portion of the Church must of necessity labour, . . . unless some measures are adopted to free the minority of the South from the oppressive jurisdiction of the majority in the North.'' This letter was signed by fifty-one Southern delegates, representing thirteen Southern Annual Conferences.[37]

The Southern Conferences all approved of the convention which had been called to meet at Louisville in May, 1845, and each Conference appointed delegates. When this convention, representing the Church in the South, met, at the appointed time, it was decided by a vote of 94 to 3 to separate from the Church, and a new Church, to be known as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was then and there organized.[38]

We pause now in the narrative to take a glance at the anti-slavery contest in some of the other Churches. The contest in the Presbyterian Church more nearly coincided with that in the Methodist. As early as 1787 the Synod of New York and Pennsylvania recommended ''in the warmest terms, to all the Churches and families under their care, to do everything in their power, consistent with the civil rights of society, to promote the abolition of slavery.[39] The General Assemblies down to 1818 took similar action. From 1835 to 1837 the subject of slavery provoked an exciting discussion in the General Assemblies, which ended by laying on the table the addresses by the abolitionist members and expelling four synods affected by abolition. In 1838 the Church

[37] The documents relating to the formation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are collected in the Methodist Property Case, p. 90 and following.

[38] For the action of all the Southern Conferences in regard to the division of the Church see ''Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South,'' Bedford, Appendix, pp. 594-628. Also Church Property Case, pp. 92-98.

[39] Matlack, p. 356.

split into the Old and New School upon doctrinal questions. The New School in 1839 referred the matter of slavery to the local presbyteries; in 1840 certain presbyteries, which had excluded slave-holders from their pulpits and communion tables, were asked to rescind their action; in 1843 the Assembly did "not think it for the edification of the Church to take any action on the subject." In the General Assemblies of 1846, '49, '50, '53, slavery was condemned. In 1857 it was reported to the General Assembly that in the Presbytery of Lexington South, many ministers, ruling elders, and members "held slaves from principle and of choice, believing it to be, according to the Bible, right." The Assembly called upon that presbytery to review and rectify their position, stating that "such doctrines and practices can not be permanently tolerated in the Presbyterian Church." The Old School Assembly in 1845 condemned the apostles, for "they did not make the holding of slaves a bar to communion, and therefore the Church has no authority to do so." In the Assemblies of 1846, '49, '50 slavery was condemned, but from 1850 to the breaking out of the war the subject of slavery was laid on the table.[40]

The Baptist Church, unlike the Methodist and Presbyterian, had no great struggle, as a denomination, over the question of slavery, which was due to the fact that the Baptist Church had no central legislative body. In this denomination, however, a separate Anti-Slave Missionary Board was sustained for many years, and the Free-Will Baptists refused fellowship to all slave-holders as early as 1839.[41]

The Protestant Episcopal Church ignored the slavery question in its ecclesiastical assemblies, but there was, however, considerable controversy among individuals

[40] "Slavery and Abolition," A. B. Hart, pp. 213, 214. Baird, "History of the New School," pp. 506-558.

[41] Matlack, p. 354.

within the Church, and in 1861, at a convention of delegates from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States, held in Montgomery, Ala., definite action was taken to separate from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.[42]

We return now to the Methodist Church. In the report of the Committee on the Division of the Church, which had been adopted by the General Conference of 1844, the first resolve states "that, should the delegates from the conferences in the slave-holding States, find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the northern boundary. . . . All the societies, stations, and conferences adhering to the Church in the South, by a vote of a majority of the members of said societies, stations and conferences, shall remain under the unmolested pastoral care of the Southern Church; and the ministers of the M. E. Church shall in no wise attempt to organize Churches or societies within the limits of the Church South, nor shall they attempt to exercise any pastoral oversight therein; it being understood that the ministry of the South reciprocally observe the same rule in relation to stations, societies and conferences adhering by vote of a majority, to the M. E. Church, provided also that this rule shall apply only to societies, stations and conferences bordering on the line of division, and not to interior charges which shall in all cases be left to the care of that church within whose territory they are situated."[43]

The Methodist Episcopal Church in the North claimed that the Church South had violated their agreement made in the General Conference of 1844, in that they proceeded immediately to organize a separate Church without waiting for the Annual Conferences in the South to vote upon the division, which action they

[42] *Zion's Herald,* Aug. 21, 1861.
[43] Debates in the General Conference, 1844, pp. 217-219.

claimed invalidated the whole plan of separation. Immediately each Church began to make great efforts to retain the border, and there was more or less constant conflict between them, along the border, up unto and through the Civil War. Each side claimed exclusive rights to be there, and each posed as being basely persecuted by the other. The contest between the Churches was especially severe in Western Virginia,[44] Missouri, and Kentucky. It was not an uncommon thing for a Church service conducted by one side of the controversy to be broken up by a mob representing the other. In Wood County, Va., a grand jury for the superior court declared that the *Western Christian Advocate,* a paper published by the Methodist Episcopal Church, was "an incendiary publication printed with the intent to make insurrection within the Commonwealth of Virginia," and to read it or even receive it was deemed an act of felony, and the person "convicted thereof shall be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary of this Commonwealth for not less than two years nor more than five."[45]

With the beginning of the Kansas struggle the bitterness between the two Churches increased considerably, especially in Western Missouri. One pastor (Methodist Episcopal) writing from Platte County in 1855, says, "I am still threatened with a coat of tar and feathers, but as yet none have undertaken the enterprise."[46] On Sunday, June 24, 1855, a mob of about one hundred men broke up a small congregation in Platte County and compelled the two preachers in charge of the services to sign a statement that they would not preach or hold any more meetings in the county.[47] In August of the same year another Metho-

[44] "Cleavage between Eastern and Western Virginia," Ambler, "Am. Hist. Rev.," July 1910, pp. 762-780.
[45] Matlack, pp. 187, 188.
[46] *Central Christian Advocate,* June 14, 1855.
[47] *Central,* June 19, 1855.

dist preacher in Western Missouri was taken by a gang of eighteen men to the county seat, accused of preaching abolition doctrines and circulating abolition literature, and after a public meeting in the courthouse he was given seven days to leave the State.[48]

In the spring of 1855 a seminary—the Missouri Conference Seminary—located at Jackson, Mo., sought to obtain a charter from the Legislature. Objection to granting the charter was raised on the ground that one of the incorporators, a Rev. Mr. Houts, was a communicant of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Long and bitter debate ensued, in the course of which the Methodist Episcopal Church was denounced as a company of abilitionists and free-soilers, and when the vote was finally take the charter was refused—59 to 36.[49] In the fall of the same year the Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was announced to be held in Independence, Jackson County, Mo. On August 13th the citizens of the county held a meeting in the courthouse for the purpose of remonstrating against the holding of the Conference in Independence, and passed resolutions to that effect, in which they state, "the supposed anti-slavery sentiment and opinions of the ministers and others who will constitute said Conference may lead to results and acts to be regretted."[50] This warning was evidently taken by the authorities of the Missouri Conference, for the announcement was made soon after that the session of the Conference would be held in St. Louis instead of Independence.[51]

One of the most atrocious instances of pro-slavery interference with the Methodist Episcopal Church oc-

[48] *Ibid,* Aug. 9, 1855.

[49] *Ibid,* March 8, 1855. The *Central Christian Advocate* is a particularly valuable source for the contest in Missouri and Kansas. It was published in St. Louis and was nearer than any other Methodist journal to the scene of the border conflict.

[50] *Western Dispatch,* Independence, Mo., Aug. 17, 1855, copied in the *Central,* Aug. 30, 1855.

[51] *Central,* Sept. 29, 1855.

eurred in Rochester, Andrew County, Mo., in June, 1855. A public meeting had been held in the town, in which the Methodist Episcopal Church had been declared a "nuisance, a stench in the nostrils of our people," and stating also that "there can be no good or satisfactory reason offered why a Southern community should tolerate the existence of a church in their midst, which declares that its members can not hold slaves, that the institution of slavery is against the spirit of religion." The preacher in charge of the Rochester Circuit had not listened to the threats of this meeting, and proceeded to conduct a protracted meeting, but on going to the church with two of the leading laymen of the congregation he was met by a mob of from eighty-five to one hundred men; one of the laymen with him, who was over seventy-one years of age, was shot and almost instantly killed, and the minister was taken, tarred, and feathered, and ordered to leave town immediately.[52]

From 1845 to 1860 the Methodist Episcopal Church was active in certain districts in Northeastern Texas, which territory was included in the Arkansas Conference. On March 10, 1859, the Arkansas Conference convened at Bonham, Fannin County, Tex., presided over by Bishop Janes. The next day a public meeting was held in the court-house, presided over by the postmaster and addressed by some of the most prominent men of the county, at which resolutions were adopted stating: "WHEREAS, A secret foe lurks in our midst known as the Northern Methodist Church, entertaining sentiments antagonistic to the institution of slavery; and, WHEREAS, The growth of this enemy would be likely to endanger the perpetuity of that institution in Texas; and, WHEREAS, Sentiments opposed to the interests of the South have been expressed on our streets by Northern Methodist preachers; therefore, *Resolved,* That the

[52] Copied from the St. Joseph *Gazette* by the *Central,* June 26, 1856. Also *ibid,* July 10, 1856; Aug. 14, 1856.

Northern Methodist Church in our midst is a screen behind which the emissaries of a Northern political party hide, known as abolitionists, and is dangerous to our interests and ought not be tolerated; *Resolved* (2), That the expressed sentiment of Northern Methodist preachers against slavery is an insult to our people; *Resolved* (3), That these views do not meet the views of the people of Fannin County, and their expression must therefore be stopped; *Resolved* (4), That a committee be appointed to urge the Legislature to pass laws punishing the utterance of such sentiments; *Resolved* (5), That a committee be appointed to wait upon the bishop and ministers of the Conference and warn them against continuing the Conference." The sixth resolution states that their motto is, "Peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must," and the last resolution declares that they band themselves together to suppress abolitionism in our midst, and to henceforth allow no public expression of abolition doctrine in the county. On Sunday morning the committee of about fifty men went to the church where the session of the Conference was being held, and crowded into the building just as Bishop Janes had read his text to begin his sermon. A Judge Roberts, the spokesman of the committee, addressed the bishop and told him of the proceedings of the meeting; the resolutions were then read and the Conference given two hours to decide on a course of action. The bishop then spoke to them in a kindly conciliatory manner, and on their departure proceeded with his sermon. After the services a meeting of the ministers was held, and a committee of two were appointed to report that they, the preachers, would refrain from preaching until they had met with the official members of their respective charges.[53]

In Kansas Territory a number of "Northern" Meth-

[53] *Central,* April 27, 1859.

odist preachers received rough handling at the hands of pro-slavery mobs. The Methodist Episcopal Church was far more active in the Territory from the beginning than the Church South. The superintendent of the Southern work in the Territory reported in 1850 that there were "but four preachers besides the superintendent laboring among the settlers and four laboring among the Indians,"[54] while in that same year the Methodist Episcopal Church reports fourteen preachers besides superintendents and other helpers, and about one thousand members.[55] One preacher writing from Lawrence, in July, says, "Our work increases daily; no Church is prospering like our own in this soil, and the call for preaching is in almost every direction."[56] The pro-slavery element in Kansas was very bitter against preachers of free-soil opinion and a number of ministers were summarily dealt with. One of the most famous instances of such treatment was that of the case of Rev. Pardee Butler, a preacher from Missouri, who came to Atchison in August, 1855, for the purpose of starting East—according to the *Squatter Sovereign,* a pro-slavery paper of Atchison—"to get a fresh supply of free-settlers from the penitentiaries and pest houses of the Northern States."[57] He expressed his opinion rather too freely to suit the pro-slavery citizens of Atchison, who sent a committee to him to request his signature of certain resolutions previously passed by a meeting held in the town. On Butler's refusal to sign the resolutions he was placed on a raft of two logs with his baggage and sent adrift on the Missouri River, with warnings never to return. The next spring, however, he returned to Atchison on business, and again he was seized by a mob, which threatened to shoot him, but

[54] *Ibid,* April 26, 1855.
[55] *Central,* July 26, 1855.
[56] *Ibid,* July 19, 1855.
[57] "Geary and Kansas," John H. Gihon, p. 48.

finally tarred and feathered him instead, and sent him out of town.[58]

From 1844 to 1860 the two wings of the Methodist Church grew gradually farther and farther apart, the Church in the North becoming more and more emphatic in its denunciation of the institution of slavery, while the Church in the South grew more and more energetic in its defense. During this period slavery was the question par excellence of the pulpits and the Church press. Hardly an issue of a Church paper, North or South, for twenty years before the war but had something to say upon the burning question.

The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church which met in Pittsburgh in 1848 refused to receive fraternal greetings from the Church South. In the debate over the question one delegate said, "The sympathies of this General Conference are entirely on the side of liberty . . . and that the prevailing sympathies of the Church South are on the side of slavery." In reporting this action in *Zion's Herald,* the editor stated that this "important act is not only a declination of fraternal relations, but its whole import is a verdict against slavery. . . . Let it go forth that the Methodist Episcopal Church rejects all alliance with pro-slavery ecclesiastical bodies."[59]

Before the General Conference of 1856 there was considerable agitation within the Church over the question of the relation of the Church to slavery. The ultra-anti-slavery sentiment favored the withdrawal entirely from slave territory, or else passing a rule entirely prohibiting slave-holding by Church members. This course was opposed vigorously by the majority of Methodists living in or adjacent to slave territory. During the

[58] *Ibid,* pp. 75, 76. This whole story will also be found in Report of Comm., 1st and 2d Sess., 34th Cong., vol. 2, 1855-56, pp. 260-264. From the Report of the House Investigating Comm. sent to Kansas in 1856.

[59] Matlack, pp. 190, 191.

years 1855 and part of 1856 there was a bitter controversy between the *Northwestern Christian Advocate,* of Chicago, and the *Central Christian Advocate,* of St. *Louis,* over this question, and most of the other Church papers in the country took sides with either one or the other on the question at issue. The *Northwestern* and the *Northern Christian Advocate,* with *Zion's Herald,* favored a change in the rule and an entire withdrawal of the Church from all connection with slavery, while the *Central, Western, Pittsburgh,* and *New York Christian Advocates* favored no change in the rule and a continuance of the Church in slave territory. All the Church periodicals, however, claimed to hold slavery a great evil and to seek its extirpation. The editor of the *Northwestern Advocate* warns the brethren in the border Conferences that they "are on the road to the Church South by a philosophical necessity."[60] To this the *Central* replies by giving the reasons why the Methodist Episcopal Church will not fall into the same errors on slavery as did the Church South. He states: "(1) We went to a tried people—people who opposed the Church South at all hazards and with danger to themselves. (2) We go with the experience of the Methodist Episcopal Church constantly before our eyes and with her fate as a warning. (3) The guards against being betrayed into the same errors are much greater now than they were in the early history of the Church. We went then as we go now, to be sure, avowedly anti-slavery, but hailed as abolitionists by our affectionate brethren. (4) The radical difference in the spirit of the two Churches will forever prevent any affiliation. (5) We have our brethren in the Free States to exercise a guardian watch care over the Church in slave territory."[61] In a later issue the editor of the *Central* says, regarding the attitude of his journal toward

[60] *Central,* July 26, 1855.
[61] *Central,* Aug. 2, 1855.

slavery, "We are perfectly willing to compare notes with the *Northwestern,* even on the subject of conservative, continued, and practical opposition to slavery."[62] The editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* says, "It is all moonshine to talk about preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church having no business in Slave States. . . . It is nonsense to talk of excluding all slave-holders from the Methodist Episcopal Church."[63]

Concerning the Methodist Episcopal Church in Western Virginia in 1855, a correspondent to the *Central Christian Advocate* writes: "Without relinquishing in any degree the position the Methodist Episcopal Church has occupied on the subject of slavery, this Conference makes progress in the face of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which is pro-slavery. Thus the Methodist Episcopal Church in West Virginia is a living protest against the evils of slavery, and uses their authority, by way of discipline, to ameliorate the condition of the slave and to prepare, as far as she may, both master and slave for emancipation."[64] In a long article in a Church periodical in 1855 on "Slavery and the Church," Dr. J. P. Durbin, then secretary of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, sums up the conservative opinion in regard to slavery as follows: . . . "The relation of the Church to slavery . . . and how it should be treated by the Church, constitute a most momentous question. To answer the question the New Testament must be the guide. (1) There is not a passage in the New Testament expressive of approbation of slavery. (2) The early Church indicated her disapproval of slavery indirectly. (3) The early Church laid down general principles which, when carried out, would necessarily work its abolition. (4) Finding slavery in existence, the early Church laid down

[62] *Ibid,* Aug. 16, 1855.
[63] *Western Christian Advocate,* July 26, 1855.
[64] *Central,* June 28, 1855.

certain rules for master and slave." Then he proceeds to point out the similarity of conditions in regard to slavery, between the apostolic and the Methodist Episcopal Church. Both Churches found slavery in existence; in both master and slave were converted and brought into the Church; in neither Church was the relation of master and slave a bar to Church membership; both claimed the right to enforce upon master and slave their respective duties; and last, both the apostolic and the Methodist Episcopal Churches clearly maintained their disapproval of slavery as a condition of society and of the individual, and sought its extinction. Then he asks the question, "What more can the Methodist Episcopal Church do to bring about extirpation of slavery?" This he answers by stating that, "instead of separating all slave-holders from the Church, let her retain her authority over them and enforce the duties which grow out of the relation of a Christian master to his dependent slave, and out of the relation of both to the Church." And then he advocates the rigid enforcement of Church discipline, compelling masters to recognize marriage between slaves, and the relation of parents and children, and should regulate the sale and purchase of slaves, which provisions, he claims, would tend to limit the power of the master over the slave, and by forbidding the separation of parents and children the internal slave-trade would be broken up, and this would finally lead to the breaking up of slavery itself.[65]

The bishops in their Episcopal Address to the General Conference of 1856 have this to say regarding the relation of the Church to slavery: "We have six Annual Conferences which are wholly or in part in slave territory, having a membership of 143,000 (white) and 28,000 colored. . . . In our judgment the existence of these Conferences and Churches under their present circumstances does not tend to extend or perpetuate slav-

[65] *Central*, Aug. 30, 1855.

ery. They are known to be organized under a diseipline whieh charaeterizes slavery as a great evil, whieh makes the slave-holder ineligibile to any offieial station in the Church where the laws of the State in whieh he lives will admit of emaneipation . . . whieh prohibits the buying and selling of man, woman or ehildren with an intention to enslave them, and enquires what shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery.''[66]

In the General Conferenee of 1856 the eommittee reported favorably to ehange the General Rule on Slavery, making it more denuneiatory, but after a long debate, eovering many days, a vote on the change was prevented. If the rule on slavery had been ehanged at this time, shutting out slave-holders from Chureh membership, the Chureh in the Border States would without doubt have suffered a considerable loss, and would perhaps have resulted in praetieally driving the Methodist Episeopal Chureh from slave territory. Previous to the General Conferenee of 1856 there was considerable talk of a second division of the Chureh over the slavery question, especially on the part of the editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* and others who took his view of the situation—the extreme anti-slavery wing, or, as they were then called, the ''New Rulists.''[67]

Between the General Conferenees of 1856 and 1860 the agitation over the adoption of the ''New Rules'' or slavery eontinued, and by the time the next General Conferenee eonvened, in May, 1860, its passage was practieally assured. All the important Chureh papers

[66] General Conference Journal, 1856, pp. 199, 200.

[67] In an article in the *Am. Hist. Rev.*, July, 1911, on ''The Fight for the Northwest,'' by W. E. Dodd, the statement is made that the Conferences along the Ohio and Mississippi, and even those farther north, were weakening in their anti-slavery attitude during the years 1856-60. There was some difference of opinion as to how the Church should deal with slavery, and the border Conferences were naturally more conservative than others farther north, but I find no traces of weakening, nor going over to the South, but rather a tendency to become more strongly anti-slavery.

had expressed themselves as favorable to its passage except the *Advocate and Journal,* of New York. The editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* expresses his position in these definite terms: "(1) The General Rule should be so amended as to condemn, . . . slave-holding, as explicitly as it condemns slave-buying and selling. (2) That the chapter should be amended in conformity with the amended General Rules so as to condemn slave-holding in the membership without regard to the distinction of official and unofficial members."[68]

When the General Conference convened in Buffalo, N. Y., May 1, 1860, the Committee on Slavery was well-nigh swamped with memorials. There were 811 petitions, signed by 45,857 names, asking for a change of the rule in slavery, and 137, with 3,999 signers, asking that no change be made.[69] The largest number of memorials advocating no change came from the New York East and New York Conferences, and over half the signers were from territory contiguous to New York, which shows the influence of the *New York Christian Advocate.* This General Conference expressed its disapproval of the conservative position of the *New York Christian Advocate* by electing a new editor, Dr. Abel Stevens; the retiring editor receiving only 73 votes, while his opponent, Dr. Edward Thomson, received 142.[70] A new editor was also elected for the *Central Christian Advocate,* at St. Louis. Charles Elliott, the new editor, receiving 131 votes, the retiring editor 83.[71] The reason for this change being the same as in the case of the New York *Advocate.*

This General Conference, after another long discussion, passed what was known as the New Chapter on Slavery, which read: "We believe that the buying, sell-

[68] *Western Christian Advocate,* Jan. 5, 1859.

[69] General Conference Journal, 1860, pp. 425-426. For a list of petitions and memorials presented to the General Conference of 1860 see Appendix F.

[70] *Ibid,* p. 239.

[71] *Ibid,* p. 242.

ing, or holding of human beings as chattels is contrary to the laws of God and nature; inconsistent with the Golden Rule, and with that rule in our Discipline which requires all who desire to remain among us to do no harm, and to avoid evil of every kind. We therefore affectionately admonish all our preachers and people to keep themselves pure from this great evil, and to seek its extirpation by all lawful and Christian means.''[72]

After the passage of the New Chapter there was considerable protest from along the border, especially from the Baltimore, East Baltimore, and Western Virginia Conferences.[73] This resulted in the withdrawal of a number of ministers and members from the Methodist Episcopal Church, many of whom went over to the Church South. There were also, at this time, a few independent congregations organized in Baltimore, made up of those who objected to this new rule on slavery, which went under the name of the Central Methodist Church.[74]

The slavery struggle within the Church was very naturally influenced by the larger struggle going on in the Nation and by the various questions relating to slavery and slavery extension, which came before Congress between the years 1850 and 1860. The Methodist Episcopal Church, through its periodicals especially, almost invariably took a strong anti-slavery position. While the great debate over Mr. Clay's Compromise measure of 1850 was in progress in Congress, the Church press ''almost universally'' throughout the North took a stand against the measure,[75] and after Mr. Webster had delivered his famous seventh-of-March speech the Church press vented their disapproval upon him.[76] As

[72] General Conference Journal, 1860. Also McPherson, pp. 494-496.

[73] See chap. ii for conditions in the border Conferences.

[74] McPherson, pp. 525-533.

[75] *Zion's Herald*, March 27, 1850; also *Western*, April 3, 1850.

[76] ''History of the United States,'' Rhodes, vol. i, p. 155.

an example of the editorials in the Methodist journals upon this question I quote one from the *Western Christian Advocate,* from the able pen of Matthew Simpson, then editor of that journal:[77] "What do they (the Southern statesmen) expect to accomplish by the present threats (of secession)? We answer, (1) They expect to procure the passage of a bill containing strong and offensive provisions in reference to the recapture of fugitive slaves. (2) They expect to procure the passage of territorial bills, without any prohibition of slavery.

"These are the measures for which they contend, and to accomplish their ends they must frighten the North, or at least they must make such a demonstration as shall enable the Northern men with Southern principles to say that they were frightened into a compromise. A compromise of what? Either California has a right to prohibit slavery or she has not. If she has, why purchase that right by a compromise, on any other question? If she has not that right, let her be rejected, and let it be published to the world that, in our glorious Union, men have no right to be free unless they buy it by a compromise. . . .

"A fugitive slave bill with odious features and a Territorial bill without the Proviso (Wilmot) we expect will be passed. Already several Northern leaders, among whom Mr. Webster ranks conspicuous, have gone over to the South and under the fair name of Compromise and of settling all questions, they will probably procure a majority to go with them. What will be the result? Will a settlement be effected? Will the agitation cease? We answer, no." The working of the fugitive slave law, he goes on to state, will keep the whole country in a state of excitement. . . . "Averse as we are to all inter-meddling, by the religious press in party politics, yet we would consider ourselves irreverent to our trust, did we not utter our voice on this question."

[77] *Western,* April 3, 1850.

Methodist Episcopal Church and Civil War.

In the great debate in Congress over the Compromise Bill of 1850, the split in the Methodist Episcopal Church received some attention. Calhoun, speaking of the cords binding the States together, said, "Some are spiritual or ecclesiastical, some political, others social. . . . The strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature consisted in the unity of the great religious denominations, all of which originally embraced the whole Union." Here follows comments as to the organization of the Churches in the United States. "All this combined," he continues, "contributed greatly to strengthen the bonds of the Union." The strong ties which held each denomination together formed a strong cord to hold the whole Union together, but as powerful as they were, they have not been able to resist the explosive effects of slavery agitation.

"The first of these cords which snapped, under its explosive force, was that of the powerful Methodist Episcopal Church. The numerous and strong ties which held it together are all broke and its unity gone. They now form separate Churches, and instead of that feeling of attachment and devotion to the interests of the whole Church which was formerly felt—they are now arrayed into two hostile bodies, engaged in litigation about what was formerly their common property.

"The next cord that snapped was that of the Baptists, one of the largest and most respectable of the denominations. That of the Presbyterians is not entirely snapped, but some of its strands have given away. That of the Episcopal Church is the only one of the four great Protestant denominations which remains unbroken and entire."[78]

Webster, in his famous seventh-of-March speech, replying to Calhoun, also made reference to the schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in these words: "The honorable Senator from South Carolina the other day

[78] Congressional Globe, vol. xxi, part 1, p. 453.

alluded to the separation of that great religious community, the Methodist Episcopal Church. That separation was brought about by differences of opinion upon this particular subject of slavery. I felt great concern as that dispute went on, about the result. I was in hopes that the differences of opinion might be adjusted because I looked on that religious denomination as one of the great props of religion and morals throughout the whole country, from Maine to Georgia, and westward to our utmost western boundary. The result was against my wishes and against my hopes. I have read all their proceedings and all their arguments, but I have never yet been able to come to the conclusion that there was any real ground for that separation,'' but it was brought about by lack of ''candor and charity.''[79]

That the snapping of the ecclesiastical cords binding the North and South had considerable influence in making the final breach between the sections, there can be no doubt. Indeed, the claim has been made by various Church writers that the split in the Churches was not only the first break between the sections, but was the chief cause of the final break.[80]

The question might be fairly raised here, Why were the Church ties the first to give way? I see two reasons why this was true. First, because the governing bodies of the Churches at that time were composed entirely of ministers, and they of all classes of men were the least likely to compromise, especially on questions which they considered moral; and second, because the Church generally in the North had come to look upon slavery as a great sin, and they looked at the question almost solely from that standpoint, thus compelling them to take an uncompromising position.

The Churches and Church people throughout the North were also very much aroused by the introduction

[79] ''Webster's Works,'' vol. v, p. 331.
[80] ''The Church and the Rebellion,'' Stanton.

in Congress by Douglas of the "Kansas-Nebraska Bill" and its threatened repeal of the Compromise measures of 1820 and 1850. "Perhaps no measure before Congress ever exeited more thoroughly the moral and religious sentiments of the nation."[81] Mr. Everett presented to Congress a memorial protesting against the bill, signed by over three thousand New England elergymen of various religious denominations, and the religious press of the country gave large spaee to the discussion of the measure. The editor of the leading Methodist journal stated in a long editorial, "To admit or to tolerate slavery in the Territories, . . . justifies the reproaches of the eivilized world upon the people of the United States,"[82] and another Methodist journal states editorially: "We see the religious papers in the North in general deelare against the bill, on the general prineiples of morality and good faith. We trust every eitizen who loves his eountry will use his influenee against the bill."[83] The editor of *Zion's Herald,* of Boston, in the issue of Mareh 8, 1854, says, eoneerning the passage of the bill by the Senators: "We feel siek at heart as we sit down to reeord the shameful fact that the United States Senate has passed the Nebraska Bill by a vote of 37 yeas to 15 nays. This is a treaeherous deed, disgraeeful alike to the Senate and the Nation. . . . It has disgraeed the South in the eyes of the whole world; . . . they have proved themselves to be false to their word, covenant breakers, unworthy of the respeet of honest men, deserving only of contempt."[84] . . .

This entranee of ministers and the Chureh press throughout the North into the politieal arena aroused the eriticism of those favoring the bill, both in and out of Congress. Mr. Douglas, on the floor of Congress, speaking of the memorial of the New England elergy-

[81] Wilson, "Rise and Fall of the Slave Power," vol. ii, p. 393.
[82] *Christian Advocate,* March 2, 1854.
[83] *Western,* March 1, 1851. [84] *Zion's Herald,* March 8, 1854.

men: "It is presented," he said, "by a denomination of men calling themselves preachers of the gospel, who come forward with an atrocious falsehood and an atrocious calumny against the Senate, desecrated the pulpit, and prostituted the sacred desk to the miserable and corrupting influence of party politics." "I doubt," he said, again, "whether there is a body of men in America who combine so much profound ignorance on the question upon which they attempt to enlighten the Senate as this same body of preachers."[85] The *Nashville and Louisville Christian Advocate,* the chief journal of the Church South, criticises the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* for his editorials on the subject, and states: "We most sincerely wish that he and all the religious editors in this land would attend to their appropriate work, and leave great National questions and State politics to the people as citizens. . . . Better preach repentance and faith and holiness than to meddle with the organizations of States and Territories."[86] While the editor of another journal of the Methodist Church South urges the "Southern Methodist preachers, as such," to "stick to their work of great moral reform and allow the people who are competent to attend to the affairs of the Nation and the State."[87]

The status of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the opening of the war may be summed up as follows: (1) It had become by this time practically unanimous in its opposition to slavery; the only exception was along the border, where a few slave-holders were still identified with the Methodist Episcopal Church. The great contest over the question of slavery was practically settled in the Methodist Church before the final struggle in the Nation began. (2) The great majority of the

[85] Wilson, vol. ii, p. 393.

[86] *Nashville and Louisville Christian Advocate,* quoted in *Christian Adv.,* April 6, 1854.

[87] *Holston Christian Advocate,* quoted in *Christian Advocate* as above.

membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was in the Free States, and a very large majority of them were ready to identify themselves with any political movement which might rid the Nation of the institution of slavery, which they regarded as a sin, and which they had almost completely driven from the Church. (3) The membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the opening of the war, by States, was as follows:[88]

[88] *Methodist Almanac*, 1862, p. 24. These returns were taken from the Minutes of the Conferences for 1861 and 1862. This is the only place where I found the membership given by States.

Maine	24,267
New Hampshire	11,757
Vermont	15,442
Massachusetts	30,737
Connecticut	18,849
Rhode Island	3,067
New York	164,146
Pennsylvania	107,368
Delaware	10,838
Maryland	56,220
District of Columbia	3,956
Virginia	41,872
Ohio	138,650
Kentucky	3,405
Indiana	92,884
Illinois	91,811
Michigan	33,137
Wisconsin	23,570
Minnesota	5,895
Iowa	39,646
Missouri	7,738
Kansas	4,357
Nebraska	1,542
Colorado	391
California	4,252
Oregon	2,619
Washington	242
Total	984,933

CHAPTER II.

The Methodist Episcopal Church on the Border.

In this chapter we will discuss the Methodist Episcopal Church in its relation to the Civil War in those States commonly known in war times as the Border States; namely, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri. In 1861 there were six Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church wholly or partly within these States: the Baltimore, East Baltimore, Philadelphia, Western Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, with a total membership of 149,840.[1]

The "New Rule" on slavery, passed by the General Conference of 1860, meeting at Buffalo, which declared "the buying, selling or holding of human beings as chattels" to be "contrary to the laws of God," and calling upon the preachers and people to keep themselves pure from this great evil," had aroused considerable opposition in the Border Conferences, especially in Maryland.[2] So strong was this opposition in the Baltimore Conference that in its session in 1861 resolutions were drawn up declaring the Baltimore Conference "separate and independent" of the General Conference, and stating that they would not reunite with the rest of

[1] Membership of Border Conferences from the General Minutes, 1861, pp. 11, 17, 21, 24, 26.

Philadelphia (in slave territory)	35,293
Baltimore	43,581
East Baltimore	39,519
Western Virginia	21,792
Kentucky	3,405
Missouri and Arkansas	6,245

[2] McPherson, pp. 494, 495.

the Church until (1) the New Rule had been abrogated, (2) the subject of slavery had been transferred to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Annual Conferences, and (3) a fair proportion of periodicals had been placed under the charge and direction of the slave-holding Conferences. Bishop Scott, the presiding officer, had refused to put the question on the adoption of the resolutions, declaring such action "a violation of the order and discipline" of the Church, but a majority of the Conference were in favor of such action.[3]

The East Baltimore Conference at its session in 1861 adopted resolutions calling for the repeal of the new chapter, declaring that there could be no administration under it, and asking the concurrence of all the Annual Conferences in a proposition which should give each Conference full power over slavery within its bounds. The only Conference to concur in this action was the Philadelphia, which did so by a vote of 174 to 35.[4] The Western Virginia and Kentucky Conferences, though not concurring with the action of the General Conference of 1860 on the subject of slavery, were not inclined to reopen the question.[5]

The Missouri Conference in a series of resolutions also refused to concur in the resolutions sent from the East Baltimore Conference, stating that while they deeply sympathized with the other Border Conferences on the question of slavery, yet they were unwilling to renew the controversy; and as the "New Chapter" was only declarative and advisory, they had no grievances to be redressed.[6]

The sessions of the Border Conferences in 1861 were all held in March, just after the inauguration of Presi-

[3] *Annual Cyclopædia,* 1862, pp. 580, 581; also McPherson, p. 496.

[4] Matlack, pp. 321, 322.

[5] McPherson, p. 496. For Western Virginia's resolutions, *Ladies' Repository,* May, 1861, p. 320.

[6] McPherson, p. 496.

dent Lincoln, and all of them exeept the Baltimore passed resolutions expressive of loyalty to the National Government and the new administration. This was significant, as it was still undeeided whether or not Maryland, Virginia, Kentueky, and Missouri would pass seeession ordinanees.

Maryland was fortunate in having an exeeutive in Governor Hicks—who, by the way, was a communicant of the Methodist Episcopal Church—who was thoroughly loyal to the Union, and it was largely through his efforts in refusing to eall a special session of the Legislature that Maryland was saved to the Union. After the excitement which followed the fall of Ft. Sumter and the attack on the Sixth Massaehusetts in the streets of Baltimore, Union sentiment in Maryland rapidly inereased, and by the middle of May, Maryland was strongly on the side of the Union.[7]

At the beginning of the war the Baltimore Conference contained a large number of disloyal members, most of whom came from Northern Virginia, but during the year praetically all of this element withdrew and joined the Church South. At the session of that Conferenee in 1862 sixty-six ministers were reported as withdrawn, and the membership, whieh was 43,581 in 1861, was given as 18,679 in 1862.[8] Later several other ministers, sympathizing with their Virginia brethren, withdrew from the Conferenee and organized three independent Methodist Churches in Baltimore. These eongregations were afterwards suspeeted of disloyalty; one of the ministers, a Rev. Mr. Dashiell, having removed a United States flag from a sehool whieh he eondueted, eausing eonsiderable agitation and resulting in military interference.[9] After the withdrawal of these pro-slavery members the Baltimore Conference was overwhelmingly

[7] Rhodes, vol. iii, pp. 388-390. McPherson, pp. 8-10.
[8] Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1862, p. 10.
[9] For full account of the Church trouble in Baltimore see McPherson, pp. 524-532.

loyal. At its session in 1862 resolutions were adopted expressing abhorrence of the rebellion and approving and indorsing "the present and patriotic administration of the Federal Government." The third resolve is of special interest, stating, "That in our patriotic efforts in the past or present to sustain the Government . . . we are not justly liable to the charge of political teaching, and in the inculcation of loyal principles and sentiments we recognize the pulpit and the press as legitimate instrumentalities."[10] A number of the ministers of the Baltimore Conference, while loyal to the Union, were opposed to abolition, especially in the early years of the war. A Rev. Mr. Bull, an ex-chaplain in the Union army, stated on the floor of the Conference at its session in the spring of 1863 that he hated abolitionism as he hated hell, and considered it the worst heresy out of hell.[11] Concerning the session of 1863, a certain member of the Conference stated that fully two-thirds and perhaps more of the members were thoroughly loyal to the Union.[12]

At the session of the Conference in the spring of 1864 strong and loyal resolutions were adopted. The second resolve stated "that we will not receive into the Conference or elect to ministerial orders . . . any man of known disloyalty."[13] By this time also there was evidence that the hostile attitude of some of the members toward abolition was changing, for the third resolve stated "that the time is coming when the Baltimore Conference will no longer be embarrassed in maintaining that well-known principle of the Methodist Episcopal Church upon this subject (slavery)."

The East Baltimore Conference lost practically no members by withdrawal, on account of disloyalty or pro-slavery sentiment, and the resolutions on the state

[10] *Christian Advocate*, March 13, 1862.

[11] *Ibid*, April 16, 1863. [12] *Ibid*, April 30, 1863.

[13] *Ibid*, March 17, 1864.

of the country passed by this Conference at its various sessions during the war are invariably loyal.[14]

The whole Methodist Episcopal Church in Maryland was generally considered most loyal. A correspondent of the Cincinnati *Commercial,* writing from Baltimore, says: "The principal secessionists of the city are the lawyers, the aristocracy, and a majority of the plug-uglies. The Methodists and the mechanics are almost to a man for the Union. Considering the fact that the Methodists have over forty Churches, and that they outnumber nearly all the other Protestant Churches combined, the fact is a significant one."[15]

One of the Maryland Methodist preachers, writing to one of the Church papers from within the State, says, "My lot is east among people who believe that a firm and loyal adherence to our country in these times of trouble is obedience to God." Another writer states that, "as a whole, the Methodist Church of Baltimore is eminently loyal. Its ministers, with a few exceptions, both in the pulpit and out of it, throw the whole weight of their influence in favor of the Government."[16] Still another enthusiastic writer goes so far as to claim that Maryland owes her safety to Methodism more than to any other element. To prove this statement, he declares that Methodism, being the most numerous denomination in the State, may almost be said to be the ruling element in the State, and that Maryland Methodism has been thoroughly loyal and anti-slavery. As additional proof he cites the fact that Governor Hicks, whose heroic firmness has given him a National reputation, is a Methodist, and also that the city of Baltimore elected a Methodist council, and the council, in reorganizing the police force, put two Methodists at its head.[17]

---

[14] *Western,* March 12, 1862; *ibid,* March 25, 1863; *Christian Advocate,* March 17, 1864.

[15] The Cincinnati *Commercial* quoted in *Christian Advocate.*

[16] *Christian Advocate,* Jan. 2, 1862.

[17] *Ibid,* Aug., 1864.

As has already been stated, the Philadelphia Conference at its session in March, 1861, passed resolutions concurring with the action of the East Baltimore Conference, in calling for the repeal of the "New Chapter" on slavery, but at every subsequent session during the war such action was taken as to render the loyalty of that body unmistakable. At its next session (1862), held in Philadelphia, just previous to the commencement of the proceedings, a large flag with the motto "God and our Country" inscribed upon it was unfurled, while the members cheered.[18] At this session also a long series of patriotic resolutions were passed, declaring the rebellion treason, and stating that the army and navy have their deepest sympathy and prayers, and pledging themselves to use their influence to encourage and assist them in saving the Union.[19] At this session also the Conference directed that the candidates for admission into the Conference be required to answer the question, "Are you in favor of sustaining the Union, the Government, and the Constitution of the United States against the present Rebellion?"[20] And every member of the Conference was required to vote on the resolutions affirming loyalty, and even those absent when the vote was taken were required to record their vote some time during the session.[21]

In a series of resolutions adopted at the session of 1864 occurs this interesting one: "*Resolved,* That, forbearing as we desire to be toward all ministers who have fallen in the error either of pro-slaveryism or disloyalty, we record it as our solemn judgment that no such man ought to be a religious teacher in our Church, and if there be any such, we do hereby request him to withdraw from among us."[22] This resolution was adopted, with only three dissenting votes. At this same session an-

[18] *Ibid,* March 27, 1862.

[19] Minutes Philadelphia Conference, 1862, pp. 45, 46.

[20] *Ibid,* p. 7. [21] *Ibid,* p. 6, 8. [22] *Ibid,* 1864, p. 8.

other series of patriotic resolutions were adopted, containing eight long resolves which leave no doubt as to the loyalty of the preachers of the Philadelphia Conference. Also at the session of 1864 the resolution concurring in the protest of the East Baltimore Conference on the "new chapter" passed in 1861 was repealed.

Among the resolutions adopted at the session in March, 1865, just a few days before the surrender of Appomattox, is one indorsing the Thirteenth Amendment, and another congratulating Maryland on the adoption of her new constitution and in the concurrence of her Legislature in the Thirteenth Amendment, showing that the border Methodists had changed ground completely on the slavery question and by the close of the war welcomed emancipation.[23]

We turn now to a consideration of the situation in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri. The condition of Methodism in these Border States was somewhat different than in Maryland, in that the Methodist Church South was also occupying the Territory, and in two of the States, Kentucky and Missouri, were very much stronger in membership than the Methodist Episcopal Church. On the other hand the Church South reported no members in Maryland in 1861 whatever.

In 1861 the white membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in these three Border States was as follows: Western Virginia, 10,898; Kentucky, 41,043, and Missouri, 40,593;[24] while the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in these same States in the same year was: Western Virginia, 21,792; Kentucky, 3,405, and Missouri, 6,245.[25] This situation naturally led to a very complicated state of affairs in these three States.

The people of Western Virginia had very little sym-

[23] *Ibid,* 1865, pp. 49, 50.

[24] Methodist Almanac, 1861, p. 26.

[25] General Minutes, 1861, pp. 17, 21, 24.

pathy with the people of the eastern section of the State, by reason of the fact that they owned few slaves and their occupations and characters were different. The controversy between Eastern and Western Virginia did not originate with the war and did not grow out of the question of loyalty or disloyalty, but was of much longer standing and grew out of social, industrial, and climatic differences. The people of the western section of the State had long felt that they had little part in the affairs of Virginia, for the western counties had never held a senatorship or a governorship.[26] When the Methodist Episcopal Church divided, in 1844, over slavery, naturally the larger proportion of the Methodists in Western Virginia remained in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and when the agitation over secession began, practically all of them were in favor of remaining in the Union. When Governor Letcher called a State convention to consider secession there were mass-meetings held in the western counties against it, and in the convention twenty-nine Western Virginia representatives voted against secession, and only seven for it.

The attempt to carry out the Ordinance of Secession in Western Virginia met with resistance, and a movement was set on foot early in 1861 to form a government for the western counties. A formal convention of delegates from forty western counties met June 11, 1861, at Wheeling. Each delegate took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and a declaration of independence was signed by all the delegates. In July, 1862, Congress passed a bill admitting the State of West Virginia into the Union, and on April 20, 1863, it was formally declared a part of the Union by the President's proclamation.[27]

Since 1856 the Methodist Episcopal Church in West-

[26] *Congressional Globe*, 37th Cong., 2d Sess., Part iii, pp. 2415-2419. The best narrative of the formation of West Virginia is the speech of Senator Willey, delivered May 29th, found in the above.

[27] McPherson, pp. 377, 378.

ern Virginia had championed the cause of the Union, and her ministers had boldly preached against the dis-Unionists. "Tell them" (the members of the Methodist Church South), said one preacher, "that the Methodist Episcopal Church shall exist on slave territory to the end of time, and that, as a heaven-appointed instrumentality, . . . we shall aid in preserving the integrity of the Union."[28] While another writer says, in 1861, "If Western Virginia is saved, she will owe her salvation more to Methodism, under God, than to any other agency."[29] Many of the Methodists in Western Virginia in 1861 had refused to take the *Baltimore Christian Advocate* because it was tolerant on secession and slavery. One preacher writes that his people on his circuit have refused to take the paper, and that he has discontinued it himself.[30] Another correspondent of the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate* in 1862 states that all the ministers of the Western Virginia Conference are loyal, and that only about one-twentieth of the membership show any disloyalty whatever, and he states, "Our Church has better prospects in Western Virginia than ever before."[31]

It is claimed by many old residents of Northern West Virginia that the Methodist Episcopal Church dismembered Virginia. The entire accuracy of this statement may be questioned, but it is significant that the Union and the Southern "strength of Western Virginia in 1861 could have been measured and located by determining the membership and location of the various Churches of the Methodist Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal Church, South, respectively."[32]

[28] "Defence of the M. E. Church," pamphlet, by Rev. Wesley Smith, cited in "Cleavage between Eastern and Western Virginia," Ambler, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, July, 1910, p. 770.

[29] "Southwestern Methodism," Elliott, p. 265.

[30] *The Methodist*, Jan. 12, 1861.

[31] *Western Christian Advocate*, July 20, 1862.

[32] "Cleavage between Eastern and Western Virginia," Ambler, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, July, 1910, p. 771.

We will now consider the condition of affairs in Kentucky. At the opening of the war the Church South far outnumbered the Methodist Episcopal Church in Kentucky, and the feeling in favor of secession was strong; but early in 1861 the governor and the Legislature determined on a neutral course.[33] During the course of the struggle, however, neutrality was found to be impossible, and Kentucky chose the Union side; and in June nine anti-secession congressmen out of ten were elected, the Union majority in the State being 54,700; and in August a strong Union Legislature was chosen.[34]

The Methodist Episcopal Church was so weak in Kentucky—numbering less than four thousand—that its influence was not so strongly felt as elsewhere, though wherever it was established it was identified with loyalty to the Government of the United States. A chaplain writing from Kentucky in 1862 says: "The destiny of our Church is blended in a significant manner with the destiny of the arms of the Union. . . . Wherever our arms subdue the rebellion, there our Church may raise her noble standard with every assurance of success."[35] To give an example of the fanatical loyalty of some of the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Kentucky, I quote the following, as reported in one of the Southern Church papers: "To give you the animus of the Northern Methodist Church in Kentucky, allow me to tell . . . about one Rev. Mr. Black, stationed at Newport, opposite Cincinnati. On one Sabbath he had his church ornamented with United States flags and brass eagles; his hymns were the 'Star-Spangled Banner,' the 'Red, White, and Blue,' and 'Hail Columbia.' He prayed that the Union may be preserved, 'even though blood may come out of the wine-press, even unto the horses' bridles, by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs.' In the course of

[33] McPherson, p. 8.
[34] Rhodes, vol. iii, p. 392.
[35] *Western*, Feb. 19, 1862.

his sermon he said: 'I trust our troops will rally and wipe out the disgrace of Manassas, though it cost the life of every rebel under arms. Let Davis and Beauregard be captured, to meet the fate of Haman. Hang them up on Mason's and Dixon's line, that traitors of both sections may be warned. Let them hang until vultures shall eat their rotten flesh from their bones; let them hang until the crows shall build their filthy nests in their skeletons; let them hang until the rope rots, and let their dismembered bones fall so deep into the earth that God Almighty can't find them in the day of resurrection.' ''[36]

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Kentucky contained large numbers of strong Union men; in fact, loyal sentiment was strongest in the Church South in Kentucky than in any other place. In 1862 thirty-six preachers from the Louisville Conference (Church South) were determined to adhere to the Union, and many of them intimated that if the States separated they would return to the Methodist Episcopal Church.[37] A majority of the Kentucky Conference of the Southern Church were also strong Union men, and in 1862 a number of the ministers in that Conference refused to take charges within the rebel lines. At the session of the Conference in 1864, resolutions were passed declaring the Conference practically independent of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and that the Conference was and ever had been loyal to the Government of the United States. And in the spring of 1865 eighteen of the ministers of this Conference withdrew, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church.[38]

[36] ''Moore's Rebellion Record,'' vol. iv, p. 22 (P).

[37] Annual Cyclopædia, 1863.

[38] I have drawn this information from the MSS. Journal of Rev. Daniel Stevenson, who was a member and secretary of the Kentucky Conference (Church South), and was one of the eighteen to withdraw from the Church South at the close of the war. He was also Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Kentucky from 1863-1867. The Journal is now in the possession of his son, Prof. R. T. Stevenson, Delaware, Ohio.

The situation in Missouri during the war is difficult to describe. Nowhere were the Churches more bitterly opposed to one another, and nowhere were greater cruelties and barbarities practieed in the name of the Church than in Missouri. The membership of the Church South far outnumbered that of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the State, and most of the ministers and leading men of the Southern Church favored seeession.

The seeession party in Missouri was led by Governor Jackson, while the Union party found a leader in Francis P. Blair, Jr. Regiments were organized on both sides, the seeessionists under the name "Minutemen," the Unionists were called "Wide-awakes." On May 10, 1861, Camp Jackson, near St. Louis, was taken by the Union regiments, and Union sentiment increased rapidly in the State from that time. While this contest was going on, the strife between the Churches, North and South, became even more bitter and cruel, if possible, than it had been formerly. Outside of St. Louis the religious serviees of the Methodist Episcopal Church throughout Missouri was suspended, and most of the preachers were compelled to leave the State. The minister at Jefferson City was compelled to flee to St. Louis for safety, the minister on the Jackson Circuit was driven away, leaving his family there alone for several months, the Rev. J. E. Baker was compelled to leave the Frederickstown Circuit. The presiding elder of the Jefferson City District, the Rev. N. Shumate, was pursued and often waylaid. On one occasion, while holding a Quarterly Conferenee at Leasburg, where the preaeher had already been driven away, he was threatened by a mob; but he and his congregation armed themselves, placed piekets around the house where the serviee was held, and proceeded with the service by singing,

"Though troubles assail
And dangers affright,
Though friends should all fail
And foes all unite"—

and after this the presiding elder went around on his preaching tours carrying two revolvers.[39]

The condition of affairs for the Methodist Episcopal Church in Missouri began to improve with the driving out of the rebel forces under General Price, but with the Union occupation of Missouri, persecution was begun against the Methodist Church South. The blame for this persecution was laid largely upon the "Northern" Methodists,[40] who were charged with the desire "of wreaking a mean vengeance" upon the Southern Church. The *Central Christian Advocate,* with its editor, Dr. Charles Elliott, was also accused of seizing "every event that could be tortured into an occasion for an inflammatory article against the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South."[41]

After it became evident that Missouri would remain in the Union, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South adopted a neutral position. Their Church organ in Missouri, the *St. Louis Christian Advocate,* edited by Dr. McAnally, advised their people "to remain at home, cultivate their lands, and pursue their avocations of peace and piety, in the fear of God."[42] The Church claimed to be unsectional, unpolitical, and loyal to the Constitution and Government, but that many of the members were driven by persecution to join the Confederates.[43] But in spite of their assertion of loyalty

[39] These facts have been drawn from "Southwestern Methodism," by Elliott. Dr. Elliott was editor of the *Central Christian Advocate,* St. Louis, during the war and had first-hand knowledge of many of these occurrences.

[40] "Martyrdom in Missouri," Leftwich, vol. i, p. 141.

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] "History of Methodism in Missouri," Lewis, p. 26 and following.

[43] *Ibid,* p. 22.

the Methodist Church, South in Missouri had difficulty in persuading the authorities to believe it, and it is true that every opportunity was seized by the Methodist Episcopal Church to increase these suspicions. The long story of persecution of the Church South in Missouri has been collected by an ardent partisan of that Church into two good-sized volumes called "Martyrdom in Missouri," and the length of the story will give an idea of the extent of the persecution.[44]

On the other hand the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church took pains to make their loyalty as conspicuous as possible.

At the session of the Missouri Conference of 1862, held in St. Louis, the members unanimously resolved, on the first day of the session, to testify their loyalty to the Union by taking the oath of allegiance in a body, and the provost marshal, General Farrar, was invited to perform that duty. After taking the oath, a number of patriotic addresses were made, including one by the provost marshal. A prominent member of the Conference in his address stated that no credit was due them for loyalty, for a disloyal Methodist minister was a heretic by his own book. Formerly, said he, "heretics were burned, but he would suggest that now they be only hanged."[45]

The editor of the *Central Christian Advocate* was presented with fifty dollars by the Southern Illinois Conference for the purpose of buying a flag to display over his editorial room. This flag was made by five "Union, Christian, Methodist" ladies of St. Louis, among them being the wife of General C. B. Fisk. On the flag were the mottoes *"E Pluribus Unum"* at the top, and on each side respectively were "God and Liberty" and "Sustain the Union," and at the bottom

[44] "Martyrdom in Missouri," by Rev. W. M. Leftwich, D. D., St. Louis, 1870, 2 vols.

[45] *Christian Advocate,* March 13, 1862.

was, "The *Central Christian Advocate* of the Methodist Episcopal Church of 1784." This flag was carried around the country by the editor to a number of Conferences, and was displayed at the General Conference of 1864, in Philadelphia.[46]

There were a number of instances in Missouri where ministers and members of the Church South changed to the Methodist Episcopal Church solely on the ground of loyalty to the Government. A convention of Union members of the Church South was held August 6, 1863, which adopted an address to the Missouri Conference of that Church, announcing their intention to remain in the Church South only if that Church would be loyal to the Government of the United States.[47] In 1863 practically the whole congregation of a Southern Methodist Church in Louisiana, Mo., came over to the Methodist Episcopal Church,[48] and from various places in the State Union men in the Church South applied to the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church to send them loyal preachers.[49]

One minister, writing from St. Joseph, Mo., says that he is occupying the edifice of the Methodist Church South at the request of the Union members of that Church.[50] Another minister from St. Louis writes that in one Methodist Church (North) of that city one hundred and twenty-nine new members had been gathered within four weeks, and that more than half of them had come from the Church South. He also states that at a certain service in this church the President's proclamation was read and prayers offered for the Union.[51] Still another minister, writing from Lebanon, states

[46] For the complete story of this flag, told by its owner, see "Southwestern Methodism," Elliott, p. 311-313.

[47] Annual Cyclopædia, 1862.

[48] *Ibid*, 1863, p. 629.

[49] "Southwestern Methodism," pp. 412, 413.

[50] *Christian Advocate*, April 10, 1863.

[51] Ibid, April 24, 1862. This was the Union Methodist Episcopal Church.

that there are more loyal members in the Church South than he had anticipated, and that in a certain country congregation of that Church, consisting of forty-eight members, only three were disloyal.[52]

The Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church appropriated $7,000 in 1863 for the extension of the Church in Missouri, and in St. Louis an organization was formed for the purpose of encouraging Methodists to come to the State,[53] and during the war the Church made considerable increase throughout the State, mostly secessions from the Methodist Church South.[54] At the session of the Missouri Conference in 1864 it was reported that four Southern Methodist preachers had joined the Conference and that more than one thousand loyal members of the Church South had joined the Church during the year.[55]

A writer in one of the Church papers in 1864 says, "We think we are justified by the facts in claiming for the Methodist Episcopal Church all along the border the credit of having stood faithfully by the Government, and that about in proportion to the prevalence of Methodism (Northern) in most localities have the people been loyal." This does not seem to be an extravagant claim, and that the people represented by the Methodist Episcopal Church were among the most loyal along the border there can be no reasonable doubt, and also that they exercised a considerable influence in keeping those States in the Union is a fact that can not be safely disputed.[56]

---

[52] *Ibid,* January 1, 1863.
[53] Annual Cyclopædia, 1863, pp. 629, 630.
[54] *Ibid,* 1864, p. 514. General Minutes, 1865, p. 6.
[55] *Christian Advocate,* March 7, 1865.
[56] *Ibid,* June 30, 1864.

CHAPTER III.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in the New England Atlantic States.

In the course of this chapter we will consider the general patriotic activities of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the ten States embraced in the New England and Atlantic groups; namely, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. The number of Methodists in the New England group in 1861 was 104,119, and in the Atlantic group 328,627; the total number in the two groups being 432,746.[1] Within this territory there were twenty Conferences and 2,759 preachers.[2]

---

[1] The number of Methodists in the New England and Atlantic States in 1861, by States, was as follows:

New England Group:	
Maine	24,267
New Hampshire	11,757
Vermont	15,442
Massachusetts	30,737
Connecticut	18,849
Rhode Island	3,067
Total	104,119
Atlantic Group:	
New York	164,146
New Jersey	46,275
Pennsylvania	107,368
Delaware	10,838
Total	328,627

[2] The Conferences within these States were the Black River, Delaware, East Genesee, East Maine, Erie, Genesee, Maine, Newark, New England, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, New York East, Oneida, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Providence, Troy, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Methodist Episcopal Church and Civil War.

The Methodist Church in the New England States was not nearly so large, proportionately, as in other sections of the North, but, though comparatively small, it exercised considerable influence, and its membership, almost to a man, was loyal to the Government and to the administration.

At this period New England Methodism had a number of preachers of great eloquence, who made it a practice of preaching "political sermons" on various occasions. For over twenty-five years slavery and abolition had been common pulpit themes in New England, and with the breaking out of the war political sermons became more common, and practically all the Methodist preachers in New England discoursed upon these subjects. One of the most eloquent and brilliant of these preachers was Rev. Gilbert Haven, D. D., who was a bitter enemy of slavery and an intense patriot.[3] A few days after the election of 1860 he preached a sermon on the "Election of Abraham Lincoln,"[4] which, when printed, was dedicated "to the Honorable Charles Sumner," and on various other National occasions during the war, such as Thanksgiving, New Year's, and fast days, he preached sermons bearing on the National affairs. In a New Year's sermon preached in Boston in January, 1864, he reviewed the National events of the year 1863 in a most eloquent and effective manner, which must have had telling effect when delivered with his dramatic method.[5]

From time to time such sermons by various preachers appeared in *Zion's Herald,* the Methodist paper of New England. Such a sermon appeared in its columns on October 9, 1861, from the text, "Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bonds of wickedness,

[3] Gilbert Haven, afterwards elected to the bishopric.

[4] "National Sermons," Haven. This sermon was preached in the Harvard St. Methodist Church, Cambridge, Mass.

[5] "National Sermons," Haven. "The Wonderful Year."

to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?'' (Isa. 58:6.)[6] An outline of a sermon on secession appeared in *Zion's Herald,* September 25, 1861, which I reproduce here as a clever if not a typical example of such discourses:

TEXT: ''If the foot shall say, because I am not the hand I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body?'' (1 Cor. 12:13.)[7]

I. The Doctrine of Secession—I am not of the body.

(a) The Antiquity of this Doctrine. It was proclaimed a long while ago. Lucifer and his compeers (or co-imps) avowed it. Because they could not reign they decided to secede and set up a confederacy. ''Better reign in hell than serve in heaven,'' said the president of the first seceded government.

(b) The Promulgation of this Doctrine. Not satisfied with seceding themselves, the fallen angels began to tamper with the other subjects of God's government.

(c) The Present Phase of the Doctrine. The same as ever . . . it simply seeks to overturn government by promulgating the old doctrine, ''I am not of the body.'' Therefore, being the foot, I propose to walk off and take care of myself, and allow others to do the same, provided they allow me to take all I want.

II. The Ground on which the Doctrine is put. ''Because I am not the hands.'' If the foot had been the hand, that is, if it had been satisfied, it would not have advocated the doctrine, therefore

(a) Dissatisfaction justifies secession. . . .

(b) The dissatisfaction of the minority justifies secession. . . .

(c) Pride enough to avow, and wickedness enough to defend the doctrine of secession are the grounds upon which it is put.

. . . If the doctrine of secession be right and just, it follows:

1. That every man has a right to break up the government which he can not control.

---

[6] Preached by Rev. E. S. Stanley on ''The National Fast Day.''
[7] *Zion's Herald,* Sept. 25, 1861.

2. That the father of seeession (the devil) and John Brown and Jeff Davis are among the few who have understood the true prineiples of government, and ought to be eanonized.

It was a eommon sight in New England, during the war, to see a United States flag floating from the tower of a ehureh, espeeially in the towns and eities. Sueh was true of St. Paul's Methodist Chureh, in Lowell, Mass.[8] On the oeeasion of raising a new flag in plaee of one damaged by a storm, the pastor of the Chureh, in the eourse of his flag-raising speeeh, said: "Let the National ensign float along our line of battle, over the impregnable fortress at the mouth of the Potomae, . . . over 'Honest Abe,' the Nation's pride and glory," . . . and elosed his speeeh with the sentenee, "The star-spangled banner; long may it wave, and soon may it be the rebel's dread, as it now is the patriot's boast."[9] The flag was also usually displayed at the various sessions of the Conferenees, and on one oeeasion the East Maine Conferenee gave a reception in the ehureh where the session was being held, to a eompany of volunteers, at whieh time the flag was suspended from the gallery.[10]

The New England Conferenees also passed patriotic resolutions at their various sessions. The resolutions of the New England Conferenee for 1862 are typieal of the others.[11] They reeognize the war as righteously visited upon the Nation for its sin in eherishing slavery. They reeognize that God has given us a President who has the respeet and the eonfidenee of the people. They hail with joy the bill abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia. They look forward to the annihilation of this foul system, and express the hope that the Government will not eompromise with this great foe of

[8] *Zion's Herald,* Oct. 2, 1861.
[9] From the address of the pastor, Rev. W. R. Clark.
[10] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* June 6, 1861.
[11] Minutes of the New England Conference, 1862, p. 24.

God and humanity in order to end the war. They state that they are bound to recognize the Constitution as supreme, and uphold the flag. They behold in the policy of the National Government and in the victories of the Union armies the triumph of the principles for which they have long labored. They promise to follow the army and its leaders with prayers and sympathy. They extend consolence to the wounded. They express pride in their Commonwealth for her part in the war. They feel bound to impress upon the conscience of the Nation more vigorously than ever before that slavery is a sin and must be subdued to gain permanent peace and prosperity.

The war was a frequent topic of discussion in the Boston Methodist Preachers' Meeting. Such questions as, "Is it under existing circumstances the duty of ministers to preach on the subject of the present war?"[12] and "Will this war result in the maintenance of our Constitutional Government as it now is over the whole country?"[13] were frequently before the meeting, sometimes the discussions continuing for several successive meetings. In these discussions the famous Father Taylor took frequent part. At one time he is reported to have said, "No secessionist should be allowed to sneeze north of Mason and Dixon's line till this war is over, nor for fifty years after."[14] At another time he is reported in the Minutes to have made a flaming speech "for war and the extermination of slavery."[15] It was Father Taylor, also, who proposed procuring a flag and extending it from the building where this body held its weekly meetings.[16]

The resolutions passed by the Boston Methodist Preachers' Meeting are interesting, showing how ex-

[12] Minutes of the Boston Methodist Preachers' Meeting, April 22, 1861.

[13] *Ibid,* Dec. 16, 1861.

[14] *Ibid,* May 13, 1861.

[15] *Ibid,* April 29, 1861.

[16] *Ibid,* June 3, 1861.

tremely radieal was the New England mind, and how intense was the feeling at the time of Mr. Lineoln's assassination. The substanee of these resolutions follows:

The Constitution defines treason and affixes its penalty. No rank or station, eivil or military, should shield from justiee the authors and leaders of the rebellion . . . Any lenieney of the government toward sueh is worse than wasted, is indeed an undeserved and grievous eruelty to the insulted sense of justiee in the minds of the brave defenders of the Union and in the heart of the whole loyal population. Never will the Nation feel its sense of honor and justice vindieated until the leaders of this unprovoked and wieked rebellion shall have suffered eondign punishment, the penalty of death; therefore,

Resolved, That no terms should be made with traitors, no eompromise with rebels; that the surrender of rebels should be uneonditional, they should be foreed to surrender and should be held to the striet justiee their erimes have merited.

That we hold the National authority bound by the most solemn obligation to God and man to bring all the eivil and military leaders of the rebellion to trial by due course of law, and when they are elearly eonvieted, to exeeute them.

That in the reeonstruetion of Southern States no man should hold offiee who held a eommission in the rebel army or in the Confederate government, nor shall he be allowed to vote.

It is the duty of the National Government to provide for the entire extinetion of slavery.

The supreme sovereignty of the United States Government must be maintained in the reeonstruetion of the Rebel States.

The last resolve pledges most earnest and eordial support to Johnson if he earries out the polieies above set forth.[17]

As typieal of the patriotism of New England Metho-

[17] Minutes of the Boston Methodist Preachers' Meeting, April 24, 1865.

dists generally and the preachers in particular, I give the following incidents:

In 1863 the Providence Conference had 117 effective ministers, and of this number five were chaplains, two had enlisted in the ranks, and a number of other ministers, too old to go themselves, had sons in the army.[18] It was not an uncommon thing for the preachers to take an active part in encouraging enlistments. A Methodist preacher in Boston, in urging his hearers to enlist, said, "I 'll enlist now, after you receive the benediction that will be a proper time to enroll yourselves under your country's flag." This minister did enlist, together with sixteen members of his congregation. Another Methodist preacher, in Newton, Mass., placed his name upon the enlistment roll at a war meeting, and then made the following appeal to the assemblage, "As a servant of my Divine Master, I do not call upon you to go, but I say unto you, Come."[19] Another minister, of New Bedford, Mass., published a sermon in which he urges all Christian men who have been drafted, *to go* into the army without hesitation, as an example to others.[20] It was stated in one of the papers in 1862 that the First Methodist Church of New Haven had furnished more soldiers for the army than any other Church in Connecticut. And this Church, at one of its Quarterly Conferences of that year, appointed a committee to send greetings to their members who were in the army.[21] That Methodist people in New England enlisted in large numbers there is an abundance of evidence.[22]

The Atlantic group of Conferences included three or four of the largest and most influential Conferences in the Church. The New York, the New York East, the

[18] *Zion's Herald,* Feb. 4, 1863.
[19] *Western Christian Advocate,* July 30, 1862.
[20] *Ibid,* Aug. 19, 1863.
[21] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* May 22, 1862.
[22] *Western Christian Advocate,* Nov. 27, 1867.

Newark, the New Jersey, and the Philadelphia Conferenees alone, in 1861, had a total membership of 184,307 and 994 regular preaehers, besides 1,003 loeal preaehers.[23]

This group of Conferenees also contained many of the most noted and influential ministers and laymen in the Chureh. Among the prominent ministers in these Conferenees during this period who took a prominent part in the patriotie aetivities of the Chureh were George R. Crooks, D. D. Whedon, John MeClintoek, Abel Stevens, Alfred Cookman, John P. Newman, R. S. Foster, J. P. Durbin, D. W. Bartine, J. F. Chaplain, and many others of more or less prominenee.

The New York East Conferenee in its various sessions during the war passed exeeptionally strong resolutions expressive of their loyalty to the Government. In the resolutions of 1861 are these words: "While we love peace and are the ministers of the Prinee of Peaee, yet we hold it to be the saered duty of all men to love their eountry and to eherish freedom, and especially in times of peril to offer our eivil rulers our aid and sympathy;" therefore . . . "we, the members of the New York East Conferenee deelare our earnest and entire sympathy with the eause of our eountry in this eonfliet, and our purpose to use all means legitimate to our ealling to sustain the Government of the United States."[24]

In the session of the New York East Conferenee of 1863 it was determined by a vote of the members to have the oath of allegianee administered to the whole body. On April 7, 1863, Judge Betts, of the United States Distriet Court, and Major General Wool, of the army, were eonduеted into the Conferenee and were given "seats within the altar near the bishop." After a few patriotie speeehes Judge Betts administered the

[23] General Minutes, 1861, pp. 241, 242.
[24] Minutes New York East Conference, 1861, pp. 14, 15.

oath, at the close of which General Wool and Hon. M. F. Odell addressed the Conference. The Minutes state: "It would be impossible to convey, in any terms, . . . a truthful view of the most impressive occasion; the vast audience was moved by emotions of moral sublimity, which nothing besides this happy union of religion and patriotism could have aroused."[25] A motion then passed that the Oath of Allegiance and those who signed it be printed in the Minutes.[26]

At this session of the New York East Conference an interesting case came before that body. One of its members, Rev. T. A. Lovejoy, had been sent to East Tranby at the session previous. The official members of that Church refused to receive him as their preacher unless he would promise not to preach National or political sermons. Mr. Lovejoy had then appealed to the presiding elder and was transferred to another Church. The Minutes state that the Conference heartily approved of his course, and a collection was taken for him amounting to $238.50, which the bishop (Baker) presented to him with appropriate remarks.[27]

At the session of this same Conference in 1864 Rev. G. W. Paddock, pastor of the Methodist Church in Lawrence, Kan., delivered an address before the body, in which he told of Quantrell's raid upon that place. The Minutes state: "It may be doubted if a single person in that large audience which listened to the speaker

[25] Minutes New York East Conference, 1863, p. 8.

[26] The following is the oath taken by the Conference: "I do solemnly swear that I will support, protect and defend the Constitution and the Government of the United States against all enemies, whether domestic or foreign, and that I will bear true faith, allegiance and loyalty to the same, any ordinance, resolution or law of any other State convention or Legislature to the contrary notwithstanding; and further, that I do this with a full determination, pledge and purpose, without any mental reservation or reason whatsoever; and further, that I will well and faithfully perform all the duties which may be required of me by law. So help me God."

[27] New York East Conference Minutes, 1863, p. 8.

was ever before so deeply moved by any public address. Tears flowed freely from all eyes, and a righteous indignation was aroused against the fiendish barbarity of our Nation's foes." The Minutes also state that at the close of the address $400 was given toward the erection of a church in Lawrence.[28] At this session it was stated by the secretary that he had been informed that the New York East Conference had been the first religious body to give moral support to the Government at the breaking out of the war. The Conference was in session when Ft. Sumter was fired upon, and immediately took action in sending words of encouragement to the President of the United States.[29]

The resolutions adopted by the New York East Conference in 1865 were very elaborate. They were drawn up by Dr. G. R. Crooks, and consisted of a long preamble followed by four resolutions, closing with the resolution that, as the President had ordered Major General Anderson to repair to Charleston on April 14th to raise over Ft. Sumter the identical flag that he was compelled by his enemies four years ago to haul down, that Revs. D. Curry, Geo. R. Crooks, and Hon. M. F. Odell be appointed a delegation to go to Charleston to represent the Methodists in that exercise. While this report was being considered, a number of patriotic addresses were made, and after its adoption by a rising, unanimous vote the whole Conference united in singing the "doxology," "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow."[30]

The resolutions adopted by the New York Conference at their war sessions were in many respects similar to those of the New York East Conference. One of the resolutions adopted in 1861 was: "We admire the spontaneous uprising of twenty millions of freemen which the first gun fired at Ft. Sumter aroused, who declare

[28] Minutes New York East Conference, 1864, p. 16.
[29] *Ibid*, p. 20. [30] *Ibid*, 1865, pp. 3, 4.

that no treasure is too costly, no sacrifice too great, no time too long, to put down treason and traitors." . . . Another resolution of this same year was: "We have unbounded confidence in the present Government of the United States, as well as in its wisdom and energy to put down rebellion, and to restore National order and tranquillity, and therefore will give it our hearty co-operation."[31]

In 1862 their resolutions stated that they would call upon their people to sustain the Government, to bear cheerfully increased taxation, and to frown upon all covert treason, holding all rebels as untrue to the Church.[32]

At the session of 1863 there was considerable patriotic demonstration during the consideration of the resolutions on the "State of the Country." The report consisted of nine resolutions, the fourth stating that "the conduct of those who, influenced by political affinities or Southern sympathies, throw themselves in the path of almost every warlike measure, is in our view covert treason."[33]

The Newark Conference in the course of its patriotic resolutions adopted in 1862 stated, "We give no countenance to any proposition which contemplates the settlement of our National troubles by a separation of the States of the Union."[34]

In its other sessions resolutions similar to those noted above were passed, with like patriotic demonstrations.[35]

In the course of the session of the Newark Conference in 1863 a "flag raising" service was held. At this service several patriotic addresses were made. One speaker stated that "people say that the ministers have

[31] *Christian Advocate and Journal*, June 6, 1861.
[32] Minutes New York Conference, 1862, p. 25; also *Christian Advocate and Journal*, April 24, 1862.
[33] *Ibid*, 1863, p. 31.
[34] Minutes Newark Conference, 1862, p. 26.
[35] *Ibid*, 1863, pp, 32, 33.

turned politicians; it is not so. If preaching loyalty to the Government be politics, then we can afford to be called politicians and, if need be, abolitionists. In this great struggle the spirit of war is the spirit of the gospel."[36]

In 1865 an interesting case came up for trial in the Newark Conference. Complaint was lodged against a certain member that he had voted illegally at the last Presidential election, having voted in Pennsylvania while a resident of New Jersey. In the report of the case it was stated that the accused had also used very objectionable expressions in reference to the Government and the rebellion. The committee passed on the character of the accused, but stated that they hoped in the future he would be more prudent and circumspect in action and utterance, and that his views on abolition and slavery would soon be brought to harmonize more fully with the position of the Church.[37]

At the New Jersey Conference in 1865 the first set of resolutions on the State of the Country, prepared by the committee, were not strong enough to suit the Conference, and were recommitted. Among these remodeled resolutions was one stating that "we sympathize with the President and heads of departments in this trying state and condition of our National affairs, and that nothing within our power to render for the support of the administration, and the most vigorous prosecution of the war, for the conquest and subjugation of the rebellion, shall be withheld."[38]

The action of the Philadelphia Conference in relation to the war has already been noted in the chapter on "The Methodist Episcopal Church on the Border."

The group of Conferences in Northern and Western New York and in Western Pennsylvania remain yet to be considered in this chapter; namely, the Troy, the

[36] *Ibid,* 1863, pp. 17, 18. [37] *Ibid,* 1865, pp. 20, 21.
[38] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* April 2, 1863.

Black River, the Genesee, East Genesee, Erie, Wyoming, and Pittsburgh.

The Troy Conference in 1861 declared "that as citizens and Christian ministers we acknowledge and proclaim, before all men, our hearty and abiding loyalty to the Constitution and Government of the United States."[39] Again, in 1863, they declare, "As Christian men and citizens we stand ready to respond to the call of our country;" and further they state that they "regard every effort of men among us to embarrass the Government in the conduct of the war as in the last degree criminal, and that we will labor to inspire a spirit of unity and loyalty among all parties in our churches and congregations, endeavoring thus to defeat the machinations of traitors and their Northern sympathizers."[40] At this session also the Oath of Allegiance was taken by the entire Conference.[41] In 1864 this significant resolution appears among the others: "That as citizens, as well as ministers, we will not only exercise our right of suffrage as occasion may require, but we will exert our influence to prevent the nomination and election of the incompetent men to all places of trust and responsibility."[42]

The Genesee Conference in 1863 pledge their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honor, to maintain the Government of the United States."[43] A year later they declare that "we will not receive into our Conference any one whose patriotism could justly be called in question," and they further state that their idea of a Christian patriot is one who believes and prays for the success of the National cause, who gives all the aid he can toward it, and who is in favor of continuing the struggle.[44]

[39] *Ibid,* May 2, 1861.
[40] Minutes Troy Conference, 1863, 1863, pp. 38, 39.
[41] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* April 30, 1863.
[42] Minutes Troy Conference, 1864, pp. 46, 47.
[43] Minutes Genesee Conference, 1863, p. 10.
[44] *Ibid,* 1864, p. 11.

The Black River Conference in session in 1861 declared that, "while we deprecate strife and bloodshed, and have earnestly hoped and prayed that they might be averted, as a body of over two hundred Methodist ministers, representing near 23,000 communicants in Northern New York, we now feel ourselves called upon, by every consideration of patriotism, humanity and religion, to do all in our power to sustain the Government of these United States."[45]

The East Genesee, the Erie, Wyoming,[46] and Pittsburgh, all had special patriotic features in their various sessions during the war. At the Erie Conference in 1862 six army chaplains were present and reported concerning their work.[47] The Pittsburgh Conference in 1863 states that "we claim the right and regard it as an imperative duty to pray publicly for our civil rulers and for the success of our arms, and to expose the wickedness of secession, and of sympathy therewith, irrespective of the sentiments of any part of the community."[48]

Concerning the Pittsburgh Conference the *Christian Advocate* states that "there is not a 'Copperhead' or sympathizer with secession in the whole body."[49] On the last day of the session of this Conference in 1863 the flag was authorized to be displayed in the Church, and "The Star-Spangled Banner" was sung. Commenting on this occasion, the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate* said: "It was a grand scene. Every countenance seemed aglow with a patriotic inspiration as the notes swelled and rolled through the Conference room. In the patriotic feeling then everywhere visible and ready

[45] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* May 2, 1861.
[46] Minutes Wyoming Conference, 1862, '63, 64.
[47] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Aug. 7, 1862.
[48] Minutes Pittsburgh Conference, 1863, p. 22.
[49] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* April 16, 1863.

to burst forth, we read in legible characters prophecies of our ultimate triumph and safety.''[50]

We have noted chiefly the formal patriotic action of Conferences in New York and Pennsylvania; we turn now to the action of individual Churches. It was not at all an uncommon thing, especially in the country districts of New York and Pennsylvania, for the Church and the preacher to take an active part in encouraging enlistments, and in some instances the preacher proved the chief assistant of the recruiting officer. Instances were known where the recruiting was conducted in churches, something on the same plan as a Methodist revival meeting. The minister and recruiting officer would stand behind the altar in the country or village church, and the preacher would urge the men to come forward and place their names on the roll, and instances have already been given where the preacher was the first to enlist.

In many of the larger Churches military companies were organized which were chiefly composed of members of the Church and congregation. Such a company was organized in Ebenezer Church, Philadelphia. Fifty-nine members of this Church entered the regular service, besides maintaining this emergency company.[51]

The women in the Churches also organized themselves into sewing societies, for the making of soldiers' underwear, knitting of socks, and for the pulling of lint. Of Wharton Street Methodist Church, Philadelphia, it is stated that ''company after company marched into this church and received articles of underwear'' and other wearing apparel made by the women of the Church.[52] In some instances the women of a certain

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] ''History of Ebenezer Church, of Southwark, Philadelphia.''

[52] ''Memorial Record of Wharton Street M. E. Church,'' J. C. Hunterson.

Church would undertake the care of all the men in a hospital.[53]

During the Gettysburg campaign, in the summer of 1863, there was considerable excitement in Southeastern Pennsylvania. Emergency companies were formed everywhere. Such a company was formed by the Methodist preachers of Philadelphia and vicinity.[54] On June 29, 1863, a special meeting of the Philadelphia preachers of the Methodist Church was held, at which time it was decided to issue a call in the *Evening Bulletin,* asking all the male members of the Methodist Church to meet in their respective churches on that same evening, "to deliberate and act upon measures for city defense." At this meeting also a committee was appointed to meet with certain Protestant Episcopal clergymen, to gain their co-operation; and also this committee was to wait upon the mayor, to ascertain how they could best serve the city.

At four o'clock of that day the ministers met again, heard the report of that committee sent to confer with the Episcopalians, after which it was determined to go in a body to meet all the Protestant clergy of the city. From this meeting all the Protestant ministers formed in line, with the flag at their head, and marched to the mayor's office to offer themselves "for service in any capacity that he may direct."[55] Many of these ministers, during these days, shouldered picks and shovels and helped throw up fortifications for the defense of the city of Philadelphia.[56]

The Methodist laity were not behind the ministers in the least in their loyalty to the United States and in their actions and expressions of patriotism. The

[53] "Seventy-seventh Anniversary of the Union M. E. Church, Philadelphia," pp. 81, 82.

[54] Minutes Philadelphia Preachers' Meeting, June 29, 1863.

[55] Minutes Philadelphia Preachers' Meeting, June 29, 1863.

[56] From the testimony of Rev. S. W. Thomas, who took part in these events.

In the New England Atlantic States.

Church papers noted from time to time certain regiments and companies which were made up largely of Methodists. Thus the Philadelphia *Inquirer* stated, in August, 1862, that the sheriff of Delaware County, Pa., had raised a company made up entirely of Methodists.[57] The laymen of other Churches also were largely represented in the army. For example, the *Western Christian Advocate* of November 27, 1861, stated that three companies of the Sixty-first New York Regiment were comprised wholly of members of Baptist Churches in New York. In another Methodist Church, out of a Bible class of eight young men five had enlisted, each of whom the minister presented with a Bible.[58]

Of the one hundred or so employees of the Methodist Book Concern in New York, twenty-four had enlisted by August, 1862, and the others had formed themselves into an association, the object of which was to care for and aid those of their number who went into the service of the United States.[59]

These instances that have been given are typical of what was going on in practically all the Methodist Churches in the North. Seldom was a sermon preached or a public prayer offered that the war was not mentioned and the people urged to a loyal support of the Government. One presiding elder in Ohio, whose district comprised territory in which "Butternuts" were numerous, preached every Sunday (so he states) on the war, and everywhere a loyal support of the administration and of the war became practically a part of the Methodist creed.

In the latter part of the next chapter a brief discussion of the number of Methodist soldiers in the Union armies will be given.

---

[57] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Feb. 13, 1862.
[58] *Ibid,* Sept. 4, 1862.
[59] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Aug. 21, 1862.

CHAPTER IV.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in the Central and Northwestern States.

The Central and the Northwestern States had a large Methodist population, and in most of them, if not in all, the Methodist Church was the most important and influential of all the Churches. In 1861 the Methodist population in the seven States in this section was 425,593, or nearly one-half of the total Methodist population in the North.[1] In these States there were 5,469 Methodist church buildings, with seatings accommodating 1,779,265 persons, with a valuation of $7,976,780. Within these States were the following Annual Conferences: Ohio, North Ohio, Cincinnati, Central Ohio, Indiana, North Indiana, Northwest Indiana, Southwestern Indiana, Illinois, Rock River, Michigan, Detroit, Wisconsin, West Wisconsin, Northwest Wisconsin, Iowa, Des Moines, Upper Iowa, and Minnesota. Within this territory also there were three German Conferences: the Central German, embracing Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan; the Northwestern German, embracing Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; and the Southwestern German, which included Missouri, Iowa, and Kansas.

[1] In 1861 the Methodist population and the number of Churches in the seven Central and Northwestern States, by States, was as follows:

	Members.	No. of Churches.
Ohio	138,650	2,341
Indiana	92,884	1,256
Illinois	91,811	881
Michigan	33,137	247
Wisconsin	23,570	320
Iowa	39,646	344
Minnesota	5,895	80

—Methodist Almanac, 1863; United States Census, 1860.

In the Central and Northwestern States.

The patriotic activities of these Western Methodists were very similar in nature to those of the Methodists in the Eastern and New England States, with the possible exception that there seemed to be even more patriotic enthusiasm there than even among their Eastern brethren. The Cincinnati Conference was especially patriotic, which is evidenced by the fact that twenty-one of her preachers went as chaplains, and also by the fact that one of the most famous preacher-soldiers, Rev. Granville Moody, known throughout the country as the fighting parson, was a member of this Conference. In 1862 the Cincinnati Conference declared, in a series of resolutions: We will "besiege a Throne of Grace in behalf of the cause of liberty and good order, and will continue our efforts publicly and privately, as ministers and as citizens in behalf of our Government, hereby declaring our willingness and determination to serve our country in any position to which that country may call us, ever holding ourselves as ready as our fathers were to consecrate to our country's interest and salvation 'our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honors.' "[2]

Again, in 1863, they declared that the cause of the country was just and right, and that the Government ought to be maintained at all hazards, and also that it was the duty of ministers to sustain the administration.[3] In 1864 the Cincinnati Conference expressed its sympathy for the administration, again, in a series of resolutions similar to those of 1863.[4]

The other Ohio Conferences seemed to be just as patriotic as the Cincinnati; indeed, it is impossible to make any distinction between any of the Conferences of this section in point of patriotism. In 1861 the North Ohio Conference declared that this rebellion should be crushed, and the integrity, union, and honor of the Nation pre-

[2] Minutes Cincinnati Conference, 1862, 12, 13.
[3] Minutes Cincinnati Conference, 1863, pp. 20-22.
[4] *Ibid,* 1864, pp. 18, 19.

served; and they further resolved that "we are first and last opposed to all compromise with armed rebels and traitors."[5] In 1862 they state that "we are proud of the universal loyalty of our ministry and membership."[6] The Central Ohio Conference in 1861 sanctioned the Government for calling into the field sufficient armies, and also stated that they deemed it the spirit of patriotism and Christianity to stand firm in the defense of the country.[7] Again, in 1863, they declare themselves truly loyal and pledge undivided support to the Government. In still another resolve this same year they affirm that "loyalty to our Government is our motto; that we hate treason, under whatever garb it may appear, and scorn the traitor who would betray his country under pretense of love."[8]

The four Indiana Conferences were in no wise behind their sister (Ohio) Conferences in expressions of patriotism and loyalty. The Southeastern Indiana Conference in 1861 stated in their resolutions "that we esteem it as a violation of the laws of God for ministers or members of our Church to give aid and comfort to the rebellion;" and in another resolution this same year they state, "We do most heartily espouse the cause of the Constitution and laws, and pledge our prayers, together with all the moral influence we may be able to exert, to the maintenance of the Government."[9] The other Indiana Conferences in 1861 passed resolutions equally emphatic in their patriotic expression.

The Indiana Conference at its session in 1862 requested the trustees of the Church in which the Confer-

[5] North Ohio Conference Minutes, 1861, pp. 28, 29.

[6] *Ibid*, 1863, pp. 31, 32. In some sections of Ohio there was a small split from the Methodist Church during the war, made up of Southern sympathizers, which organized under the name of the Christian Union Church, and which still exists in some localities.

[7] Central Ohio Conference Minutes, 1861, pp. 37, 38.

[8] *Ibid*, 1863, pp. 31, 32.

[9] Minutes Southeastern Indiana Conference, 1861; also *Western Christian Advocate*, Oct. 23, 1861.

ence was being held to hoist the American flag over the Church, which, we are told, was cheerfully done.[10] At this same session they declared, "We are as much as ever in favor of the prosecution of the war till it shall terminate in the putting down of the rebellion and in the restoration of the Federal authority."[11] This resolution is significant, when we consider the political conditions in Indiana in the fall of 1862. Formidable opposition to the administration and to the further prosecution of the war had developed in this section, showing great strength in Indiana, especially in the November elections of that year. This resolution indicates that this opposition did not receive the favor of the Methodist ministers of this section; and with a considerable degree of certainty we can state that the "copperhead" element was very small in the Methodist Church, even in the section where it prevailed the most. At this session, also, of the Indiana Conference (1862) a resolution was passed requesting Bishop Ames, the presiding bishop, to give the ministers of the Conference who were then in the army nominal appointments, in order that they might be kept as active members.[12] Again, in 1864, we find this Conference again condemning "copperheadism" in the following resolution: "We will in every laudable way sustain the Government in its efforts to put down the rebellion, both in front and rear; and in doing this we will remember that the Christian minister may speak of the citizens' civil duties."[13]

The conditions prevailing in Indiana were largely duplicated in Illinois. Each of the four Illinois Conferences expressed their loyalty in series of resolutions similar to those already noted. A Quarterly Conference in Southern Illinois stated "that it is an enormous sin against God and humanity for any person to oppose

[10] Minutes Indiana Conference, 1862, p. 4. [11] *Ibid.*

[12] Minutes Indiana Annual Conference, 1862, p. 16.

[13] *Ibid*, 1864, 34, 35. The Copperhead Secret Society, "Knights of the Golden Circle," was particularly strong in Southern Indiana.

the Constitutional Government of the United States;" and in another resolution they state, "That we regard it as the duty of every Christian minister to stand by and, as far as consistent with the ministerial character, to aid the General Government in vindicating her rights and re-establishing her authority all over this country."[14]

The Rock River Conference, which was one of the largest and most influential in the Central West, and included Chicago, was even more profuse than most of the others in their patriotic expressions. Concerning the session of this Conference in 1861 the editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* states: "The Conference is large and loyal—sufficiently so to vacate every pulpit, if need be, to sustain the Government. The National flag floated over the Conference room and many patriotic addresses were delivered by the members at a meeting called for the purpose."[15] This Conference also states in its series of patriotic resolutions for this year that any member entering the volunteer service, his name should be preserved in the records of membership; and in the preamble they state, "As Christians, as Christian ministers, we can only say this rebellion must be subdued; this Constitution must be maintained."[16] Among the resolutions of 1863 is one stating, "We continue to discountenance faint-hearted endorsement as well as avowed opposition to the Government, whether by ministers or laymen."[17] In their resolutions of 1864 all ministers who move are cautioned not to lose their vote in the coming election.[18]

The Central Illinois Conference in 1863 pays its compliments to the faint-hearted brethren in the North in these words: "We regard those misguided men in

[14] *Western Christian Advocate.*
[15] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Oct. 11, 1861.
[16] Minutes Rock River Conference, 1861, pp. 14-16.
[17] *Ibid,* 1863.
[18] *Ibid,* 1864, pp. 25, 26.

loyal States who oppose the vigorous proseeution of the war . . . as ehargeable with the blood of our slaughtered brethren as having aequired an infamy meriting the abhorrenee of all good men.''[19]

The Miehigan Conferenee in 1861 pledged their all for the support of their eountry, and promised that the men under arms should have their love, support, and prayers.[20] In 1863 they ''pledge to the President and governor of the State undivided sympathy and support nntil the Constitution shall be respeeted, the Union restored, the rebellion overthrown, and slavery blotted out.''[21] At one of the sessions of the Wiseonsin Conferenee during the war a patriotie meeting was held at whieh Bishop Baker presided. One witness states that ''enthusiasm reaehed a high point,'' and some of the brethren hardly knew whether they were fighting rebels at the front or were in a ministerial gathering in Wiseonsin. This Conferenee passed resolutions on the war, ending with the declaration, ''This rebellion, therefore, is not only against this Nation, but is treason to the entire raee and to heaven.''[22] Again, in 1863, appears this vigorous statement in a series of resolutions adopted by the Wiseonsin Conferenee, ''At sueh a time as this, neutrality is treason, silenee erime, and inaetion unpardonable.''

The long series of patriotie resolutions adopted by the Iowa Conferenee in 1861 is typieal of the patriotism of Iowa Methodists generally. Among these resolutions we find this one: ''*Resolved,* That the present Government of the United States should be sustained by every Ameriean and every resident of the United States at any expense of men and money in proseeuting this war

[19] Central Illinois Conference Minutes, 1863, p. 25.

[20] Minutes Michigan Conference, 1861, pp. 33-36.

[21] *Ibid,* 1863, pp. 41, 42.

[22] ''History of Methodism in Wisconsin,'' P. S. Bennett, pp. 190-211.

to a favorable issue."[23] One Iowa presiding elder in 1862 reports that there are very few young men left in his neighborhood, and that two of his own sons—one only eighteen years of age—have joined the army, with his consent.[24] Another minister, writing from Minnesota, states that many of the ministers are in the army, and that "we are willing to give up all for our country."[25]

So much for the formal resolutions of the Conferences in the Central and Northwestern States. We turn now to a consideration of individual Churches in this section.

I have before me a statement of a Union soldier from Southern Indiana[26] to the effect that the Methodist Church in his community was most loyal, and that many of the Churches organized companies of soldiers, and in many instances the Churches were used for recruiting purposes. In the southern parts of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, where the "copperhead" element was especially strong, feeling ran very high, and was caught even by the children. In one instance some Methodist children were playing "prayer-meeting" during these exciting times, and one of the prayers of a little fellow, who had doubtless caught the spirit of dislike for copperheads from his elders, was, "O Lord, if there are any little 'butternuts' in this house, I 'll kick them out."[27] And this illustrated the prevalent feeling in the Methodist Church in this section toward Southern sympathizers. It was a very rare thing to find a Methodist preacher who was a Democrat; and if it became known that he was one, he had a hard time collecting his salary and gaining a hearing.

[23] *Western Christian Advocate,* Sept. 11, 1861.
[24] *Ibid,* Aug. 20, 1862.
[25] *Ibid,* Dec. 11, 1861.
[26] Letter of Capt. H. D. Banta, Hanover, Ind.
[27] In some localities "butternuts" was the name applied to Southern sympathizers.

In the Central and Northwestern States.

The Conferences on the Pacific Coast—the Oregon and the California—and also the Kansas and Nebraska, have not been noted. The membership of all these Conferences was small, but none the less patriotic. During the war Dr. Caddock, pastor of the Church at Lawrence, visited the Eastern cities, trying to collect money to build a church at Lawrence. His speeches and sermons were everywhere well received and were always patriotic in the extreme. In 1863 there were seventy preachers in the Kansas Conference, and eleven of them were chaplains in the army. Nebraska Conference in the same year had but sixteen preachers, one of whom was a chaplain.

The General Conference of 1864 remains yet to be described. This, the fourteenth delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, met in the Old Union Church, Philadelphia, on the second day of May, 1864. There were 216 delegates from forty-nine Conferences, presided over by the six bishops. During the morning of the first session of the Conference a motion was made by Rev. Granville Moody, the famous "fighting parson," that "the Friday following be set apart as a day of fasting and prayer to Almighty God on behalf of our country in this hour of her peril," and that Methodist people throughout the country be requested to observe this day by similar services.[28] After some discussion this motion passed, and a committee was appointed to make arrangements for the service.

Immediately after this was done one of the delegates stated on the floor of the Conference that the loyal ladies of St. Louis had presented Dr. Charles Elliott, the war editor of the *Central Christian Advocate,* with a beautiful flag, and he made the motion that it be suspended in Union Church during the session of the Con-

[28] Journal of the General Conference, 1864, p. 22.

ferenee. This motion also prevailed, and the flag was aecordingly put in plaee.

On Wednesday the eommittee to arrange for the fast day reported that arrangements had been made to hold serviees in three ehurehes: Union, Green Street, and Salem; and there were to be three serviees at eaeh ehureh: morning, afternoon, and evening. Among those who made addresses were Bishops Morris, Janes, Seott, Simpson, Baker, and Ames, Drs. Kingsley, Thomson, Elliott, Jesse T. Peek, R. S. Foster, Joseph Cummings, Granville Moody, and Thomas A. Eddy.[29]

Among the eommittees appointed on the first day of the Conferenee was one on the State of the Country. Joseph Cummings, of the New England Conferenee, was ehairman, and Granville Moody was the seeretary of the eommittee.[30]

At the morning session on May 9th, Thomas C. Golden, of the Northwest Wiseonsin Conferenee, offered the following resolutions:

WHEREAS, It is a well-known faet that the Methodist Episeopal Chureh was the first to render its allegianee to the Government under the Constitution in the days of Washington; and[31]

WHEREAS, The fair reeord of the Chureh has never been tarnished by disloyalty; and

WHEREAS, Our ministers and people are truly and deeply in sympathy with the Government in its efforts to put down rebellion and set the eaptives free; therefore,

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed, whose duty it shall be to proceed to Washington and to present to the President of the United States, in a suitable address, the assurances of our Chureh that we are

[29] Journal of the General Conference, 1864, pp. 61, 62.

[30] For personnel of this committee see *ibid,* p. 37, 38.

[31] This refers to the fact that during Washington's first administration Bishops Coke and Asbury tendered to Washington an address expressing loyalty to the United States in behalf of American Methodism. Stevens, "History Methodist Episcopal Church," vol. ii, pp. 501-503.

with him, heart and soul, in the present struggle for human rights and free institutions.''[32]

These resolutions were referred to the Committee on the State of the Country, with instructions to report at the earliest moment, and accordingly on May 13th the committee reported favorably on these resolutions, recommending, however, that the number of the committee to bear the address to the President be five instead of three.[33] This report was adopted, and on the following day the chairman of the committee, Dr. Joseph Cummings, presented to the Conference an address to the President of the United States, and also nominated the deputation of five to bear the address to Washington. The nominations were as follows: Bishop Edward R. Ames, Joseph Cummings, George Peck, Charles Elliott, Granville Moody.[34]

The address of the Conference is too long to give verbatim, but it must not be passed over entirely. In relation to the Church's part in the war it stated: ''In the present struggle for the Nation's life many thousands of her members and a large number of her ministers have rushed to arms to maintain the cause of God and humanity. They have sealed their devotion to their country with their blood on every battlefield of this terrible war.'' Further on the address states, ''Our warmest and constant prayer is that this cruel and wicked rebellion may be speedily suppressed; and we pledge you our hearty co-operation in all appropriate means to serve this object.'' The closing paragraph reads: ''The prayers of millions of Christians, with an earnestness never manifested for rulers before, daily ascend to heaven that you may be endued with all needed wisdom and power. Actuated by the sentiment of the loftiest and purest patriotism, our prayer shall be continually for the preservation of our country un-

[32] Journal of the General Conference, 1864, p. 98.
[33] *Ibid*, p. 147. [34] *Ibid*, 155, 156.

divided, for the triumph of our cause, and for a permanent peace, gained by the sacrifice of no moral principles, but founded on the Word of God, and securing in righteousness liberty and equal rights to all.''[35]

On May 17th the committee bearing this address went to Washington to tender it in person to Mr. Lincoln. The committee adopted a suggestion of Rev. Granville Moody's that he place the address in the hands of Mr. Lincoln and make arrangements for the receiving of the committee. This was done, and on the following day at ten o'clock the President with his Cabinet formally received the representatives of the General Conference. Bishop Ames introduced his colleagues, and then requested the secretary of the committee to read the address. At the close Mr. Lincoln received the address, and then turning to his desk, he took up his reply which he had prepared over night, and read:[36]

GENTLEMEN: In response to your address, allow me to attest the accuracy of its historical statements, indorse the sentiments it expresses, and thank you in the Nation's name for the sure promise it gives.

Nobly sustained as the Government has been by all the Churches, I would utter nothing which might in the least appear invidious against any. Yet without this, it may fairly be said that the Methodist Episcopal Church, not less devoted than the best, is by its greater numbers the most important of all. It is no fault in others that the Methodist Episcopal Church sent more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospitals, and more prayers to heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Episcopal Church! Bless all the Churches! And blessed be God, who in this our great trial giveth us the Churches. (Signed) A. LINCOLN.[37]

---

[35] *Ibid*, pp. 378-380; also McPherson's ''Rebellion,'' p. 498.

[36] For an account of this meeting see the ''Autobiography of Rev. Granville Moody, D. D.,'' edited by Rev. Sylvester Weeks, pp. 441-445; also ''Lincoln's Tribute to Methodism,'' by R. T. Stevenson, *Christian Advocate*, Feb. 7, 1907.

[37] The original of this address is now in the possession of Miss Rachel Trimble, of Columbus, Ohio.

Among Methodists this noble tribute of Lincoln's is most highly treasured, and very justly so.

The next day, May 19th, the committee represented by Bishop Ames made a report of their visit to the President and read before the Conference Mr. Lincoln's tribute.[38]

The Committee on the State of the Country made their main report on May 27th. It consisted of a long preamble, followed by a series of six resolutions. In the preamble the causes of the rebellion are reviewed and the loyal position of the Methodist Episcopal Church commended. Among its sentences occur the following: "It becomes us to pray most earnestly for the end of this conflict and for a peace established in righteousness on the Word of God, but we should jealously guard against a false and hollow peace gained at the sacrifice of moral principles." Further on it continues: "We should frown with indignation on all as guilty of disloyalty who coldly criticise every measure of the administration in this struggle for the National life under the hypocritical pretense that they are careful that the fundamental law should not be violated and we should give to all honest, earnest, righteous measures to crush this rebellion our hearty support."

A summary of the six resolutions is here given:

1. The promise to remember the President of the United States and all officers of the Government and of the army and navy in their prayers.

2. They proclaim it the duty of the Government to prosecute the war with all the resource, and they promise support and co-operation.

3. The cause of the war is the Nation's forgetfulness of God and slavery, and it is the Nation's duty to humble itself to and to honor God.

4. The Constitution should be charged as to make it recognize God and the Nation's dependence upon Him.

[38] Journal of the General Conference, 1864, p. 177.

5. Slavery is abhorrent to the principles of "religion, humanity, and civilization," and they favor an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting it throughout the country.

6. While deploring the evils of war, they rejoice in the manifestation of benevolences as displayed in the Sanitary and Christian Commissions and in the associations for the Freedman, and they pledge these organizations their support.[39]

It would be interesting to know just how many soldiers in the Union army and navy were Methodists, but it is impossible to give the exact number. The Philadelphia Conference, however, in 1864 passed a series of resolutions which, had they been carried out, would have given more or less exact information in this regard. These resolutions were as follows:

WHEREAS, There now exists a fearful struggle for the maintenance of the Federal Government against treason and rebellion; and

WHEREAS, The history of this great struggle will be written and published to the world; and

WHEREAS, It is important that the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church in its connection with this struggle be correctly and fully written; therefore,

Resolved, That the members of this Conference be requested to furnish to the secretary at the next session a correct statement of the number of our Churches and congregations who have entered the United States service to put down the wicked rebellion now afflicting our country; and what number of them have held official positions in our army and navy, with their respective rank, and what number of them have been wounded, killed or died in the service of their country;

Resolved (2), That these returns be printed in the published Minutes of the Conference;

Resolved (3), That the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church be requested to present the above resolu-

[39] *Ibid,* pp. 380-383.

tions to the several Annual Conferences of the Church for their concurrence.[40]

At the next session of the Philadelphia Conference (1865) the same series of resolutions were again adopted, and were printed in the Minutes of that year.[41]

Not many of the Conferences carried out the intention of these resolutions. The West Wisconsin Conference, however, in 1862 reported the number of enlisted men from the various Churches within its bounds. This Conference embraced only eleven counties, which were not thickly populated. The number from the five districts of that Conference in 1862 was: Madison District, 75; Mineral Point District, 68; Point Bluff District, 43; Platteville District, 34; Prairie du Chien District, 19; making a total for the first year of the war of 239.[42] The members of the West Wisconsin Conference in 1862 was 7,779.[43] It was stated that these returns were imperfect, and probably a number of names were not reported, but even if Methodists enlisted in that proportion throughout the country, it would give a total of 31,000 Methodists in the Union army for the first year of the war alone, or close to 125,000 for the four years. It is probable, however, that the enlistments of Methodists in other sections of the country, especially in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, were larger in proportion than in Wisconsin. Nicolay and Hay in their "Abraham Lincoln" state that "the Western armies especially were filled with the young and vigorous fighting men of that connection" (Methodist Episcopal).[44]

We have record of a number of companies made up

[40] Minutes Philadelphia Conference, 1864, p. 51.
[41] *Ibid*, 1865, p. 52.
[42] "History of Methodism in Wisconsin," Bennett and Lawson, pp. 370, 371.
[43] General Minutes of the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1862, 1863, p. 158.
[44] "Abraham Lincoln, A History," vol. vi, p. 324.

largely of Methodists. The Ninety-eighth Ohio contained four Methodist preachers and a large supply of class leaders, stewards, exhorters, and Sunday school superintendents, and Company E of that regiment contained sixty Methodists.[45] One company from Delaware County, Pa., was composed entirely of Methodists.[46] In another Pennsylvania company containing 69 soldiers who were Church members, 35 were Methodists, 9 Lutheran, 12 Presbyterian, 1 Moravian, 8 Baptists, and 4 Episcopalians.[47] In the Fourteenth Virginia Regiment the colonel, lieutenant-colonel, and four captains, and upwards of three hundred privates were Methodists.[48]

Rev. T. B. Bratton, of the Missouri Conference, raised two companies, including many members of his own Church, for the Thirty-fourth Missouri Regiment. In a little Church at Pontiac, Central Illinois Conference, the minister and all the male members but three enlisted.[49] A large proportion of the Twelfth Michigan Regiment were members of the Methodist Church from the Niles District. The assistant editor of *Zion's Herald*, Rev. J. E. Round, raised a company of nine-months' men, and Rev. Geo. Bowler, of the New England Conference, recruited a regiment.[50] In 1862 there were nine preachers of the Western Virginia Conference in the army as chaplains.[51] Besides the large number of Methodist preachers who entered the army as chaplains there were a considerable number who became commissioned officers, and also a larger number who were simply privates. In 1862 it was reported that there were sixty-three Methodist preachers who held commissions, as follows: 4 colonels, 2 lieutenant-colonels, 1 major, 36 captains, and 20 other commissioned officers.[52]

General Clinton B. Fisk in 1862 stated that fifteen

[45] *Christian Advocate*, Sept. 11, 1862.
[46] *Ibid*, Aug. 21, 1862, from Philadelphia *Inquirer*.
[47] *Ibid*, May 5, 1864.
[48] *Ibid*, Oct. 30, 1862.
[49] *Ibid*, Sept. 4, 1862.
[50] *Ibid*, Sept. 11, 1862.
[51] *Ibid*, Feb. 6, 1862.
[52] *Ibid*, June 19, 1862.

per cent of the composition of the Union armies were Methodists,[53] and if this proportion would hold true for the four years of the war, it would bring the number to something like 300,000, which doubtless is considerably too large. A study of Methodist statistics for the war would indicate somewhat the large contribution of men to the army and navy made by the Methodist Church. In 1862 there was a decrease of 45,617 in the membership over 1861; in 1863 there was a decrease of 19,512 over 1862; in 1864 there was a slight increase of 4,926 over 1863, and again a slight increase of 939 in 1865. When the war began, the total membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was 990,447, and when the war closed there was a membership of 929,259; a net loss for the war of 61,188.[54] There is no doubt but that this loss was largely due to enlistments of Methodist men in the army of the Union.

[53] *Ibid*, March 13, 1862.
[54] General Minutes, 1860-1865.

CHAPTER V.

Methodist Missions in the South During the War.

During the progress of the war, following the success of the Union armies, many cities, towns, and other localities throughout the South, fell as a matter of course into Federal hands. In most instances where such was the case the regular ministers in charge of the various Churches in those places fled on the approach of the Federal armies and left their flocks, or what was left of them, to get along as best they might.[1] Such was the case in New Orleans, after its capture by General B. F. Butler. At least twoscore churches in that city were left unoccupied, and in the five Methodist churches in the city in 1862 there was not a single minister habitually officiating. Such was also the case in the five Presbyterian churches in New Orleans.[2] Like conditions prevailed in Baton Rouge, where a large and beautiful white marble church was standing idle; and also in Newbern, N. C.; Vicksburg, Natchez, Pensacola, Memphis, and many other places, large and small, in all parts of the South where the Union armies had met with any considerable success.[3]

This situation was brought to the attention of the high officials of the Churches in the North, and of Northern

---

[1] *Christian Advocate and Journal*, Oct. 9, 1862; also "The Church and the Rebellion," Stanton, pp. 332-334.

[2] McPherson's "Rebellion," p. 545. See table from the Report of a Committee Commissioned by the Provost Marshal General of the Dept. of the Gulf to investigate the condition of Presbyterian and Baptist Churches in New Orleans.

[3] *Christian Advocate*, Feb. 4, 1864.

Church people generally, mainly through letters written many times by army chaplains to the Church papers or to their friends, and I have found also a number of letters describing Church conditions in the South written by privates. The various issues of the Church papers of all denominations throughout the war were filled with war news, and in a prominent place, often on the front page, appeared some sort of direct communication from the seat of war. These communications often contained information concerning the condition of the Churches in the particular locality from which the letter was written. These deserted churches were sometimes used by the chaplains for services, and when this was the case the members of the congregation were usually invited to attend the services with the soldiers. But of course this could be only a temporary arrangement.[4]

That this situation in the South was generally known in Northern Church circles is evidenced by the following resolutions passed by the Methodist Ministers' Association in Boston, October 13, 1862:

Resolved, That, inasmuch as one of the consequences of the war to suppress the great rebellion in the Southern part of this country is to open large tracts of country inhabited by many thousands of our fellow countrymen who are now to a greater or less extent deprived of Church privileges, we deem it the duty of the Missionary Board of the Churches to examine the demands of such places for aid from time to time, and whenever in their judgment the employment of missionaries in those places would probably promote the cause of Christ and the salvation of souls, they should establish and sustain such missions.

Resolved, That we believe that it is the imperative duty of the Missionary Board at once to enter upon this work, and that the Churches generally would, if properly appealed to, contribute liberally to sustain them."[5]

[4] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Oct. 9, 1862.

[5] Minutes of the Boston Methodist Preachers' Meeting, October 13, 1862.

Similar resolutions were adopted in New York, Philadelphia,[6] and other places, and the Missionary Boards of the various denominations were considering the appropriation of money for special work in the South as early as November, 1862.

But before such work in the South could be undertaken by the Churches, the consent of the Government had to be obtained and the protection of the various Union commanders in the South secured. To obtain this permission, Bishop Edward R. Ames, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, went to Secretary Stanton and secured the following order from the War Department:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUDANT GENERAL'S OFFICE.
WASHINGTON, November 30, 1862.

To the Generals commanding the Departments of Missouri, the Tennessee, and the Gulf, and all Generals and Officers commanding armies, detachments, and posts, and all officers in the service of the United States in the above mentioned Departments:

You are hereby directed to place at the disposal of Rev. Bishop Ames all houses of worship belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in which a loyal minister, who has been appointed by a loyal Bishop of said Church does not officiate.

It is a matter of great importance to the Government in its efforts to restore tranquillity to the community and peace to the Nation, that Christian Ministers, should by example and precept, support and foster the loyal sentiment of the people.

Bishop Ames enjoys the entire confidence of this Department, and no doubt is entertained that all ministers who may be appointed by him will be entirely loyal. You are expected to give him all the aid, countenance, and support practicable in the execution of his important mission. You are also authorized and directed to furnish Bishop Ames and his clerk with transporta-

[6] Minutes Philadelphia Preachers' Meeting, Nov., 1862.

tion and subsistence when it can be done without prejudice to the service and will afford them courtesy, assistance, and protection.

By Order of the Secretary of War.[7]

On December 9th the same order was given concerning houses of worship of the same denomination in the Departments of North Carolina and Virginia, and delivered to Bishop O. C. Baker, and those in the Department of the South, and delivered to Bishop E. S. Janes.[8] On December 30th the same order was given concerning Methodist Churches in Kentucky and Tennessee, and delivered to Bishop Matthew Simpson.

On January 14, 1864, a similar order was issued concerning the Baptist Churches in the South, the military commanders being directed to turn over to the American Baptist Home Mission Society all churches of the Baptist Church South "in which a loyal minister of said Church does not now officiate."[9] On February 15, 1864, the military commanders were directed to place at the disposal of the agent of the "Board of Home Missions of the United Presbyterian Church" all houses of worship belonging to the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church "in which a loyal minister was not officiating."[10] An order of the War Department, dated March 10, 1864, and relating to the Presbyterian Church, states that "The Board of Domestic Missions of the Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Committee of Home Missions" has the entire confidence of the department, and the military commanders throughout the South are to permit all ministers bearing a commission from these boards to exercise the functions of their office and are to give such countenance and support.[11] This last order was issued at the solicitation of the two secretaries of

[7] McPherson, "Rebellion," p. 521; "Official Records," vol. 34, p. 311.

[8] *Ibid*, p. 521.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] McPherson, p. 522.

[11] *Ibid.*

the respective boards mentioned in the order, one located in New York and the other in Philadelphia.

On March 23, 1864, the following order to the military commanders in the South, relating to the United Brethren Church, was issued:

> You are hereby directed to give to the teachers and missionaries sent out by the "Church of the United Brethren in Christ" such privileges and facilities for their work within the limits of your commands as are usually given to others under similar circumstances and are not prejudiced to the service."[12]

These orders of the War Department opened the way for the various Churches to send their representatives into the South, and we find Bishop Ames immediately after securing the order noted above, taking a trip into the South to investigate conditions there, preparatory to sending loyal ministers into the deserted districts. And we also find the respective missionary boards and societies of the various Churches appropriating considerable sums of money to carry on this work. Early in 1864 the Missionary Board of the Methodist Church made an appropriation of $35,000 for this work in the South,[13] and a number of missionaries were sent within the Union lines to take possession of the vacant fields and pulpits. The Minutes of the various Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for 1864-65 record twenty-one regularly ordained men who were sent as missionaries to the South during the last two years of the war, and besides these there were numerous teachers and other workers sent into the field to do missionary work. Among the places to which they were sent were New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Nashville; Newbern, N. C.; Beaufort and Charleston, S. C.; Shelbyville and vicinity, Murfreesborough, and Memphis.[14]

---

[12] *Ibid.* [13] Annual Cyclopædia, 1864, pp. 629, 630.

[14] *Christian Advocate and Journal*, March 22, 1864; also General Minutes of the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1862-1865, 2 vols.

Methodist Missions in the South During War.

A few days after the occupation of the city of Charleston by the Union army, the Methodist missionary in charge of that military department visited the city to look after Methodist interests there. It was his plan to get possession of the Methodist churches in the city not simply by military authority, but at the request of the Official Boards of these Churches. This he seems to have succeeded in doing, for on March 9, 1865, we find the various officers of the Methodist Churches in Charleston passing resolutions requesting the commander of the post of Charleston to turn over to the missionary appointed to that department all the Methodist churches and parsonages in the city; also pledging to the missionary their aid, sympathy, and co-operation. Of the first service held in a Methodist church in Charleston[15] after its occupation by the Union army it was stated that the church was about two-thirds full, and that when the country and the President were prayed for there were audible responses in the congregation.

The military order relating to the churches and pul pits in Norfolk and Portsmouth will illustrate the usual method of procedure in taking military possession of the churches, and will also show to what extent these churches were controlled by the military commanders:

General Order No. 3.—All places of public worship in Norfolk and Portsmouth are hereby placed under the Provost Marshal of Norfolk and Portsmouth respectively, who shall see the pulpits properly filled by displaced, when necessary the present incumbents, and substituting men of known loyalty and the same sectarian denomination, either military or civil, subject to the approval of the Commanding General.

They shall see that the Churches are open freely to all officers and soldiers, white or colored, at the usual hour of worship, and at other times, if desired, and they shall see that no insult or indignity be offered to

[15] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* March 23, 1865.

them, either by word, look or jesture, on the part of the congregation. The necessary expenses will be levied, as far as possible, in aceordanee with the previous usages or regulations of each eongregation, respeetively. No property shall be removed, either publie or private, without permission from these head-quarters.''[16]

The following letter, dated from Memphis, Deeember 23, 1863, addressed to Bishop Ames, written by the Union eommander of that post, will further illustrate the method by whieh the Southern Chureh properties were turned over to their Northern brethren:

In obedienee to the orders of the Seeretary of War, dated Washington, November 30, 1863, . . . I plaee at your disposal a house of worship known as ''Wesley Chapel,'' in the eity of Memphis, State of Tennessee. The said house being elaimed as the property of the Methodist Episeopal Chureh, South, and there being no loyal minister appointed by a loyal Bishop, now offieiating in said house of Worship.[17]

This aetion of the Northern Churehes, in eonjunetion with the military authority, in going into the South at this time and under these eireumstanees, aroused eonsiderable hostility upon the part of the Chureh people in the South and served to inerease their bitterness of feeling toward their Northern brethren. This aetion of the Northern Churehes was denounced in the bitterest language by Southern Conventions, Presbyteries, Synods, and Conferences. In the Presbytery of Louisville of 1864, resolutions were proposed protesting against the aetion of the Board of Domestie Missions in proeuring the order from the War Department permitting that board's missionaries to go into the Southern States, and they ealled upon the General Assembly to ''at onee disavow the said aet, so that the Church may be saved from the sin, the reproaeh, and ruin whieh this thing is ealeulated to bring upon her.''[18]

[16] ''The Church and the Rebellion,'' Stanton, pp. 239.
[17] McPherson, pp. 522, 523. [18] McPherson, p. 522.

Methodist Missions in the South During War.

On April 6, 1864, a convention of ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, from States within the Federal lines met at Louisville, Ky., for the express purpose of adopting measures for the preservation of their Church properties. Eight Conferences were represented. This convention adopted the following resolutions upon the subject:

WHEREAS, Under an order issued by the Secretary of War, the authorities of another ecclesiastical body, distinct from, if not antagonistic to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have been impowered to take possession of the houses of worship belonging to said Church; and

WHEREAS, We are informed and believe that said order does not meet the approval of the President of the United States; and further, believing that in the judgment and enlightened Christian feeling, both of the officers of the army and many sober-minded Christians, the order is regarded as unjust, unnecessary and subversive alike of good order and the rights of a numerous body of Christians; therefore,

Resolved, That we do most respectfully protest against the execution of said order, and request the President to restrain and prevent its enforcement.[19]

It was the feeling among many Southern Methodists that the Church in the North was trying to absorb the Southern Church. Indeed, many of the leading Methodists in the North expressed the opinion that the reunion of the two great bodies of Methodists ought to be attempted at the close of the war. The Union would be reunited, why not Methodism?[20] But the deathblow to any attempt at a union of the Churches, North and South, at this time was struck by the bishops of the Methodist Church South[21] in a pastoral letter which they sent out

[19] Annual Cyclopædia, 1864, p. 515.

[20] *Ibid*, 1865.

[21] The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had separated from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844 over the question of slaveholding in the Church, and since that time had maintained an entirely separate organization in the South.

over the South at the close of the war. One of the reasons they give why a union with Northern Methodism is impossible was "the conduct of certain Northern Methodist bishops and preachers in taking advantage of the confusion incident to a state of war to intrude themselves into several of our houses of worship, and in continuing to hold these places against the wishes and protests of the congregations and rightful owners." This conduct, they go on to state, causes them pain "not only as working an injury to us, but as presenting to the world a spectacle ill calculated to make an impression favorable to Christianity."[22]

One of the most famous of the cases of military interference with ministers and Churches during the war took place in connection with a certain Dr. Samuel B. McPheeters, a minister of an important Presbyterian Church in St. Louis. This case has no bearing, itself, upon the mission work of the Churches in the South, except that it is in connection with this case that President Lincoln's attitude toward military interference with Churches is most clearly brought out.[23]

On December 19, 1862, Major General Curtis, commanding the Department of the Missouri, issued an order deposing McPheeters from his pulpit and ordered him and his wife to leave the State within ten days. The order is prefaced with the statement that McPheeters has refused to declare his loyalty to the Government, had given the impression that he desired the success of the rebel armies, that the influence of his ministerial position had greatly encouraged the enemies of the Government, that he had exerted an injurious influence upon the young, and that his wife had openly avowed herself a rebel; so for these reasons, the order states, both McPheeters and his wife had forfeited the protection and

[22] Annual Cyclopædia, 1865, p. 620.

[23] All the correspondence relating to this famous case is found in McPherson's "Rebellion," pp. 533-537.

favor of the Government. The order also states that the church edifice, books and papers, are to be turned over to the loyal members of the Church, who are named, who shall secure a loyal minister to fill the pulpit.[24]

This order of General Curtis led to a long discussion between the various parties concerned, which covered more than a year, and included, besides General Curtis and McPheeters, the Attorney General of the United States, the Governor of Missouri, and the President of the United States.

On December 23d, McPheeters wrote a long letter to Hon. Edward Bates, Attorney General of the United States.[25] As a result of this letter the first order of General Curtis is modified so as not to require McPheeters and his wife to leave the State. In January, 1863, President Lincoln, writing to General Curtis concerning the case, after having had an interview with McPheeters, stated: "Now, after talking with him (McPheeters), I tell you frankly, I believe he does sympathize with the rebels; but the question remains whether such a man of unquestioned good character, who has taken such an oath as he has . . . can with safety to this Government be exiled upon the suspicion of his secret sympathies . . . But I add that the United States Government must not, as by this order, undertake to run the Churches. When an individual, in a Church or out of it, becomes dangerous to the public, he must be checked; but let the Churches, as such, take care of themselves. It will not do for the United States to appoint Trustees, Supervisors, or other agents for the Churches."[26]

Later in the year (1863) Mr. Lincoln wrote to some of McPheeters's friends, who had requested him to restore McPheeters to his ecclesiastical privileges: "I have never interfered, nor thought of interfering as to who shall or who shall not preach in any Church, nor have

[24] McPherson, p. 533. [25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Ibid,* p. 534.

I knowingly or believingly tolerated any one else to so interfere by my authority.''[27]

After this very plain statement of his position in this matter of military interference with the Churches, we may imagine the feelings of the President when he learned of the order of the War Department, dated November 30, 1863, noted above, giving the military commanders the right to seize churches and turn them over to loyal agents of Northern societies. His attention was called to this order by a certain Rev. John Hogan, claiming to represent the loyal members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Missouri, who wrote to the President, bitterly complaining of this order. On Mr. Lincoln's receipt of this letter he wrote a note to Secretary Stanton, in which he says: ''After having made these declarations[28] in good faith and in writing, you can conceive of my embarrassment at now having brought to me what purports to be a formal order of the War Department, bearing date November 30, 1863, giving Bishop Ames control and possession of all the Methodist Churches in certain Southern military departments where pastors have not been appointed by a loyal bishop or bishops . . . and ordering the military to aid him against any resistance which may be made to his taking such possession and control. What is to be done about it?''[29]

In response to this vigorous letter of the President, the Secretary of War directed that an explanatory order be issued, in which it was stated that the order of November 30, 1863, was designed to apply to those States as are in rebellion, and is not designed to operate in loyal States, ''nor in cases where loyal congregations in rebel States shall be organized and worship upon the

[27] McPherson, p. 536.

[28] Declarations, cited above, made in reference to the McPheeters' case.

[29] McPherson, p. 522, note.

terms of the President's amnesty.''[30] On the same day that this explanatory order was issued, Mr. Lincoln sent a note with the above order to Rev. John Hogan, in which he states: ''As you see within, the secretary modifies his order so as to exempt Missouri from it. Kentucky never was within it, nor, as I learn from the secretary, was it ever intended for any more than a means of rallying the Methodist people in favor of the Union in localities where the rebellion had disorganized and scattered them. Even in that view I fear it is liable to some abuses, but it is not easy to withdraw it entirely and at once.''[31]

Mr. Lincoln was certainly never in favor of this plan of military interference with the Churches, as his words very clearly indicate; and, doubtless, if he had discovered the order of November 30, 1863, sooner it would have been withdrawn ''entirely and at once.'' On March 4, 1864, he wrote to the Union commander at Memphis regarding some interference by the military with a Church there: ''If the military have need of the church building, let them keep it, otherwise let them get out of it, and leave it and its owners alone, except for causes that justify the arrest of any one.'' Two months later, May 13, 1864, the President wrote again to this same commanding officer: ''I am now told that the military were not in possession of the building, and yet, in pretended execution of the above, they, the military, put one set of men out of and another set of men into the building. This, if true, is most extraordinary. I say again, if there be no military need of the building, leave it alone, neither putting any one in or out of it, except on finding some one preaching or practicing treason, in which case lay hands on him, just as if he were doing the same thing in any other building, or in the street or highways.''[32] These vigorous words

[30] *Ibid.* [31] McPherson, p. 522, note.
[32] ''Abraham Lincoln,'' Nicolay and Hay, vol. vi, p. 338.

of Mr. Lincoln very clearly indicate how much his patience was taxed over these petty Church squabbles.

The activity of the Northern Churches in seeking an entrance into the South during the progress of the war aroused also considerable opposition on the part of the Border State congressmen. On March 31, 1864, Senator Powell of Kentucky introduced a resolution directing the Secretary of War to turn over to the Senate all orders issued to military commanders pertaining to Church properties, and that he also inform the Senate how many Churches have been affected by this order.[33] This resolution was laid on the table—27 yeas to 11 nays—the senators from the Border States voting in the negative. In July, Mr. Powell introduced a bill making it a misdemeanor with punishment on conviction of a fine not exceeding $10,000 and imprisonment for not more than ten years, and disqualification from holding any offices under the Government of the United States for the Secretary of War or any military commander to interfere in any way with Churches or the conduct of public worship. This bill never got past the committee, but it serves to show the bitter feeling which this activity of the Northern Churches aroused.[34]

Perhaps one of the best known of these Northern missionaries who went into the South during the war was Dr. John P. Newman, afterwards a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the pastor and personal friend of President Grant. He was sent to New Orleans in the spring of 1864 to take charge of the Methodist work there, and according to the Church papers he seems to have had considerable success. Soon after his arrival in New Orleans he delivered an address in which he attempted to justify his presence there and the work which he came to do. He said: "We are denounced as Church robbers, are charged with having robbed the people of the South of their Church

[33] McPherson, p. 543. [34] *Ibid.*

properties. My answer is: The right of Church property has never been disturbed, as far as we are concerned. The General Government has seen fit to seize these churches, but it has not conveyed their title to us. There has been no passing of deeds. We do not own an inch, either of this or any other Church in the South. . . . If there has been any robbing, the accusation lies against the General Government. But the Government has committed no robbery. It was aware that these churches were occupied (so far as they were occupied at all) by congregations united by disloyal sympathies and by teachers disposed to inculcate treason.''[35]

Another writer of the period, representing the Presbyterian Church, defends this action of the Northern Churches in these words: ''The Church looked at the simple facts that many Southern pulpits were vacant and that others would become so, as our armies should advance, that Southern ministers had abandoned, or had been driven from their positions, and that the Government would not allow any but loyal men to fill their places. . . . The Gospel, therefore, would not be preached at all to multitudes of people . . . unless the Government should open the way. Under these circumstances was the Church doing wrong or right in asking the sanction of the Government, . . . obtaining a 'permit,'—for it was not more than that,—and just what is sometimes done on heathen ground, . . . to 'go into all the South and preach the Gospel to every creature?' ''[36]

The argument that it would strengthen the Union cause to have a loyal ministry and a loyal Church in the South was used frequently at this time. It is undoubtedly true that these Northern missionaries who went into the South did succeed in gathering around them a few loyal hearers, but as a rule they were not

[35] McPherson, pp. 523, 524.
[36] ''The Church and the Rebellion,'' Stanton, pp. 338-340.

influential to any appreciable extent in building up any considerable Union sentiment in the South. They did, however, serve to increase the bitterness of the strife and placed another barrier in the way of union between the Churches North and South. And one is led to express the opinion that the zeal that was manifested by the Northern Churches in forcing themselves into the South in the manner and at the time they did, was not entirely holy and unselfish, and was ill calculated to further either the cause of the Union or religion.[37]

[37] For a brief statement of the work in the South by the Northern Churches, see Nicolay and Hay's "Lincoln," vol. vi, pp. 333-338.

CHAPTER VI.

Methodist Periodicals During the War.

Among the Church agencies which made for patriotism and loyalty during the progress of the war none were more influential and far-reaching than the Church periodicals.

In 1860 the Methodist Episcopal Church was publishing perodicals, to the number of twenty-two, in every section of the North, the total subscriptions of the various official publications numbering at least 400,000.[1] Besides the official journals there were a number of independent Methodist publications, some of which rivaled

[1] The following is a list of the official publications of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with numbers of subscribers for 1860 and 1864 (Journal of the General Conference, 1860, pp. 332-358, 397-405; Journal of the General Conference, 1864, pp. 341, 345):

	1860	1864
Christian Advocate and Journal, New York	29,000	26,500
The Western Christian Advocate, Cincinnati	31,000	33,787
Northwestern Christian Advocate, Chicago	13,300	25,000
Central Christian Advocate, St. Louis	8,016	8,204
Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, Pittsburgh	8,367	.....
Northern Christian Advocate, Auburn, N. Y.	.....	.....
Pacific Christian Advocate, Portland, Ore	1,750	.....
California Christian Advocate	.....	.....
The Christian Apologist (German) Cincinnati	9,166	20,000
The Methodist Quarterly Review, New York	4,250	1,008
The Ladies' Repository, Cincinnati	41,600	33,500
Missionary Advocate, New York	12,700	22,862
Sunday School Advocate, New York	208,000	229,225
Sunday School Bell, Cincinnati	12,000	13,273
Good News, Cincinnati	.....	.....
Sonntagsglocke (German), Cincinnati	.....	.....

Besides these official publications there were a number of independent Methodist journals, some of which were extremely influential. They were: *Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal,* Boston; *The Methodist* (begun 1861), New York. Other independent journals published in Montpelier, Vt.; Rockford, Ill.; and Baltimore.

in importance and influence the best of the official periodicals.

The Methodist weekly journals which had the largest circulation and exercised the most influence during the war were the *Christian Advocate and Journal,* of New York; the *Western Christian Advocate,* of Cincinnati; the *Northwestern Christian Advocate,* of Chicago; the *Central Christian Advocate,* of St. Louis—though having a small subscription, was important because of its location—and the independent journal *Zion's Herald,* of Boston. These are the periodicals which will occupy the most of our attention in the course of this chapter.

The General Conference of 1860 had elected new editors for several of the above named papers. Before 1856 most of the Church periodicals—the *Northwestern* and *Northern Christian Advocates* and *Zion's Herald* excepted—had been cautious and conservative on the slavery question. The *New York* and *Central Advocates* had opposed any change of the rule on slavery previous to the General Conference of 1856, but the General Conference of 1860 elected strong anti-slavery editors for both these journals, and with the new editorial administration a more vigorous attitude was taken, especially by the *New York Advocate,* not only on the slavery issue, but also on all other questions agitating the Church and the Nation.

All of the official Church publications, when the war broke out, became strong advocates of the administration, firm supporters of the Government, and stood invariably for a vigorous prosecution of the war. It is true that on many questions the Church journals took extreme radical positions. Especially was this the case in regard to immediate emancipation of the slaves, which was urged from the very outbreak of the war. All the Church papers supported General Fremont in his premature proclamation, which he issued August 30, 1861, emancipating the slaves in his military district. "No

publie document," says the *Northwestern Christian Advocate,* "issued since the commencement of the present war has struck upon the heart like the proclamation of Major General John Charles Fremont. . . . The general is right. The administration may not sustain him, but the people will."[2] Again, commenting on an artiele upon the same subjeet by the editor of the *Western,* the same journal says: "The editor of the *Western* speaks in deeided terms of eensure of the manifest attempt to hedge up the way and to embarrass the action of General Fremont, and regrets that 'some high in authority and in favor with the administration have shown so determined a spirit to hunt him down.' In this the *Western* but echoes the views of the great Northwest. Never had a brave man such diffieulties thrown in his path as Fremont . . . yet he has held his way. . . . The people are ineensed."[3]

General Benjamin F. Butler also found favor with the Church periodicals beeause of his method of dealing with the slaves—elassing them as contraband of war, and putting them to work—and his name was often coupled with Fremont's in the Chureh journals, and unstinted praise was dealt out to both. One writer says: "We ask—imploringly ask—that the Government will confiseate and emancipate the slaves of rebels as fast as our armies get to them. We hail the sentiments of Butler and Fremont as the day star to our Nation."[4] It is one of the ironies of history that these two generals, Fremont and Butler, probably the two most eorrupt commanders of high rank in the Union army during the war, should have reeeived such high praise at the hands of religious journals of the North.[5]

---

[2] *The Northwestern Christian Advocate,* Sept. 11, 1861.

[3] *Ibid,* Oct. 23, 1861.

[4] *Northwestern,* Oct. 16, 1861.

[5] For an impartial estimate of these two men see for Fremont, Rhodes, vol. iii, pp. 468-482; for Butler, Rhodes, vol. v, pp. 303-310, 312, 313.

Of all these journals mentioned only one proved at all disloyal, and that one was the *Baltimore Christian Advocate;* and this paper soon after the war began suspended publication, owing to the fact that its former patrons and subscribers refused longer to support it in its disloyal course.[6]

The *Christian Advocate and Journal* in many of its issues was devoted largely to war news. Letters from chaplains and soldiers appeared in almost every issue during the war, and in its columns appeals from the various societies, such as the Christian Commission, were willingly published. From the beginning of Lincoln's administration the editor placed his journal on record as a supporter of it. In an editorial published in the issue a week after Mr. Lincoln's first inauguration, the editor says: "The incoming Executive will have of necessity a difficult task to perform. Called to the head of the Nation at the most critical time in our history, confronted at once by a most extraordinary state of affairs, such as none of his predecessors has had to contend with, and having no precedents or lights to guide him in the perilous path of duty; embarrassed by the most complicated difficulties and beset on every hand by dangers the most imminent, with but limited experience in public life and thousands anxious to defeat every well-meant effort he shall make to adjust the measures of his administration to the state of things existing, he is justly entitled to the sympathy and support of every friend of the Union. . . . Under ordinary circumstances men may perhaps be excused for nursing their opposition and hostility to a political opponent. . . . But here is a totally changed condition of things." The editor closes with the sentence, "He who loves his party better than his country is a traitor."[7] Comment-

[6] *Ladies' Repository,* July, 1861, p. 446; *The Methodist,* Jan. 12, 1861.

[7] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* March 7, 1861.

ing on the inaugural of Mr. Lincoln, in the next issue, the editor says in part: "It is therefore in no spirit of partisanship that we congratulate the whole country on the successful inauguration of Mr. Lincoln. . . . The utterances of the inaugural address must satisfy all who are not perversely determined not to be satisfied, and inspires the real friends of the country with new hopes."[8]

After the defeat of Bull Run the editor showed his good sense and farsightedness by stating: "The defeat we have suffered may be of great service. We need more efficiency and ability in some departments of the Government and more unselfish patriotism in all. . . . We must awake to the magnitude of the contest in which we are engaged."[9]

Early in 1863, during that period which is known as the darkest period of the war, when there was considerable talk of bringing the war to an end, an editorial on "Shall Our War Cease?" appeared in the *Christian Advocate and Journal.* In this editorial the editor begins by stating that the war is justifiable because it is for the defense of civil government. He then says "the war must be prosecuted," and the editorial closes with the sentence, "If with vacillation in the Cabinet, treachery in the army, and jealousy in politics we have done so much, can we not complete the work when the powers of the Nation shall be fully aroused and united and concentrated by a sense of necessity?"[10] Again, on February 26, 1863, is an editorial on the "Sin of Treason," in which it is stated: "It is a solemn duty to preach against treason. . . . It is a sin of the deepest and most aggravated nature. The life of an individual is of unspeakable value, the life of a nation still more so." Also in the next issue appears another ably writ-

[8] *Christian Advocate,* March 14, 1861.
[9] *Ibid,* Aug. 15, 1861.
[10] *Ibid,* Feb. 19, 1863.

ten editorial on "Respect for Government,[11] and in the issue following an editorial on "The Pulpit and Religious Press." The editor begins by asking, "In such a crisis as this, what is the duty of the pulpit and the religious press?" He then answers the question by stating: "They will lamentably fail before God and humanity if they do not employ all their powers in arousing the National heart and conscience to an understanding and recognition of God, of justice, of principles as related to the National life. They should bring the American people to an earnest and active appreciation of its true character and grandeur of our struggle."[12]

Enough has been given to show the general attitude of this journal on National questions. It maintained a consistent patriotic position throughout the war. It was seldom critical of the administration, though it sometimes advocated radical measures, especially in reference to emancipation, and later in reference to the freedmen.

This paper had a large circulation in Eastern New York and Pennsylvania and throughout New Jersey, the largest except one of any Methodist journal of this period. It was at that time, as it is still, the most important weekly paper in the denomination. Just before the war the independent journal *The Methodist* was established, largely in opposition to the *Christian Advocate and Journal,* and it also had a considerable circulation throughout this same territory.[13] *The Methodist* was considered by some to be lacking in patriotism, and was classed, in one instance at least, with papers of

[11] *Ibid,* March 5, 1863. [12] *Ibid,* March 12, 1863.

[13] "Life of Edward Thomson," by Thomson, pp. 145-152. This writer states that the *Methodist* was started to oppose the *Christian Advocate* in its radical position on the slavery issue, but the war coming on soon after its establishment, its editors very wisely dropped the slavery issue, became a supporter of the Government, and took up Lay Representation in the General Conference as its chief Church issue.

doubtful loyalty,[14] but any impartial investigation of its columns would find little to warrant such a classification. It was more conservative on the slavery question than its official rival, the *Advocate and Journal,* but not less loyal.

The *Western Christian Advocate,* published in Cincinnati, was considerably more outspoken in its patriotism than the *Christian Advocate and Journal.* Its editor, Dr. Charles Kingsley (to May, 1864), was more of the belligerent type than Dr. Thomson, and many of his articles and editorials are of the "fire-eating" kind. On April 24, 1861, the *Western Christian Advocate* editorially stated: "The state of the country absorbs all other topics at present. People talk nothing else, read nothing else, think nothing else; so, yielding to the universal demand, we devote a large share of our paper to such information as the people demand."[15] In this same issue is another editorial, headed "The Union Forever," and still another, addressed to the farmers, in which they are urged "to plant largely" . . . "raise all you can," and "save all you raise," so that the country may not be short of provisions to care for the increasing army. Commenting on the Battle of Bull Run in one of the July numbers,[16] the editor lays the blame of the Union defeat to the fact that the battle was fought on Sunday. He bases his argument on the fact that the soldiers were tired out and needed Sunday for rest; that if they had waited until Monday, the presence of General Johnston's forces would have been found out; and also, if it had not been Sunday, "those congressmen and their wives who went out to see the show would have been home, where they ought to have stayed," and so would not have added to the general panic.

[14] *Central Christian Advocate,* Dec. 25, 1862.
[15] *Western Christian Advocate,* April 24, 1861.
[16] *Ibid,* July 31, 1861.

In August, 1861,[17] the editor heads an editorial, "Enlistments and Re-enlistments," in which he shows the advantages of the three-months' men re-enlisting, and ends the editorial with, "We recommend to able-bodied and patriotic young men everywhere, where circumstances will allow it, to enlist rapidly till half a million are thus enrolled." Again the editor says, through the columns of his paper: "We say, let the war be pushed with all possible vigor . . . 700,000 men should be in the field within a month, and another 500,000 should be preparing. . . . Had we a son of sufficient age, we should not hesitate a moment to send him to the field of battle in such a cause; indeed, we should urge him to go at his country's call, and should he fall in defending his country's flag, we should feel that he never would find a better time to die."[18]

At the session of the Ohio Conference in the fall of 1861, Dr. Kingsley spoke before that body, defending his course in giving so much space in his paper to the cause and service of patriotism, and at the various sessions of the Ohio and Indiana Conferences the paper received their indorsement. In 1862 the Cincinnati Conference stated in a series of resolutions, "As a Conference we feel increasing confidence in the prudence, sagacity, earnestness, and fearlessness of Dr. Kingsley in these times of great ecclesiastical and political trials, and would hereby fully indorse the course of this worthy patriot."[19]

In the issue of October 16, 1861, is an editorial appeal to all Methodist people to help the Government supply the soldiers with blankets, "If you have no blanket or blankets you can spare, send along a quilt or a half dozen of them."

As has previously been stated, the Church has made

[17] *Ibid*, Aug. 7, 1861. [18] *Ibid*, July 31, 1861.
[19] Minutes Cincinnati Conference, 1862, p. 11; also 1863, p. 25; 1861, pp. 13, 14.

a hero out of Fremont, and on his removal from command of the Western army in the fall of 1861, the administration was severely criticised by the Church press. The *Western Christian Advocate* had to say of it, "Unless there are reasons for this step which the public has not yet understood, it (the removal of Fremont) will be set down as the chief of a pretty extensive catalogue of blunders."[20] In another column of that same issue is another editorial, addressed to the West and the Northwest, in which the editor states, although condemning the removal of Fremont, yet he would by no means advocate insubordination to the Government, and he would advise the people of the great West and Northwest to stand by the Government, even though they may be disappointed at some of its actions. He further states that this editorial has been induced from certain statements made by Western letter writers, saying that the people would not submit to Fremont's removal.

The issue of December 11, 1861, contains an appeal to the subscribers to renew the paper, in the course of which it is stated: "A few—thank God! the number is small indeed—will discontinue the paper because it has insisted from the beginning that the Union must be preserved at all hazards. We can well afford to spare the names of all such persons. A man who can any longer doubt the propriety of standing firmly by the country is not fit to live in it, and ought to leave his country for his country's good." . . .

The editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* had no use for any paper or person that would not support the Government. Several times he takes up arms against the Cincinnati *Enquirer*. In the December 24th issue,[21] concerning this paper he says: "It is but occasionally that we pay any attention to the attacks of the Cincinnati *Enquirer*. As a general rule it is safe to

[20] *Western*, Nov. 13, 1861. [21] Dec. 24, 1861.

pursue the course which the *Enquirer* condemns. . . . The great offense of the *Western Christian Advocate* in the eyes of the *Enquirer* is that it has always been, and always expects to be, devoted unconditionally to the preservation of the Union." The New York *Herald* comes in for condemnation also, at the hands of this doughty preacher-editor, for its lack of support of the Government. He states: "The business of the hour is the saving of the country, not the stirring up of discord among ourselves; and the man who stops to howl, while others are trying to work, is, if anything, only a wolf of a patriot." "He is simply wishing to fix his fangs on the vitals and fatten on the spoils that may come to him of a ruined country."[22] The Chicago *Times* and the Philadelphia *Sunday Mercury* are also condemned for the same reason and in the same vigorous manner.[23]

It is doubtful whether the Government during these troublesome times had a more loyal supporter than the *Western Christian Advocate* and its editor. Its patronizing territory included Southern Indiana and Ohio, where a considerable opposition party had developed, and where the secret societies opposed to the war were the most vigorous. The "Copperhead" element was perhaps strongest in this region, and the staunch patriotic attitude of this paper doubtless had considerable influence in keeping the Methodist people loyal.

We close these comments on this paper by quoting in full an especially vigorous and eloquent editorial entitled "Attention! Young Men," which is a call to young men to enlist: "The index finger on the great dial-plate that counts and reveals the movement of ages, to-day points to the hour in which your Nation's doom for the next thousand years is cast; and it is for you, young man, to say what that doom shall be. Shall it be Union, Peace, Brotherhood, Liberty, Freedom, and

[22] *Western*, July 16, 1862. [23] *Ibid*, Jan. 7, 1863.

equalizing, humanizing Christianity? Or shall it be disunion, war, selfishness, slavery, and a besotted, barbarous, brutalizing, bastard corruption and perversion of our holy religion? You, young man, must decide it. . . . Do you ask what you can do? The very question is an implied disgrace, either to your manhood or to your intelligence. When your Government is nearly throttled by treason, and calling for strong hands to strike down the traitors, you wait, lazily—to sell tape and pins, or retail billet paper and quills, or make entries in business account-books, or show bonnets and ribbons to sauntering damsels! . . . Will you leave your country in the hour of her peril to be defended by strangers, or to fall, and crush you in her fall? While you might be heroes such as earth's history has never yet shown, will you stand behind counters, or sit in offices and nurse your inefficient hands, or wait for trade and gossip? Is this the destiny for which your mothers bore you? Is this the duty for which God, in His great mercy, created you, and with His boundless grace redeemed you? Is it for this that your country has educated you? Shame on such dastardly good-for-nothingness!

"Come up to the help of your country! Enlist in her armies! Fill up the numbers of that host that shall swear allegiance to patriotism and duty, and that shall tread treason and traitors under their feet as they would tread the life out of serpents and scorpions.

"Your country calls! Quick, be ready! Come to the help of your land against the mighty and diabolical minions of treachery and rebellion! One man now enlisted is worth a score in six months! Come now to the armies."[24]

The next periodical we will consider is the *Central Christian Advocate,* published at St. Louis. The conditions under which this periodical was published dur-

[24] *Western Christian Advocate,* Aug. 6, 1862.

ing the war were considerably different than those of the New York or Cincinnati papers. This was due to the fact that it was published in slave territory, and also to the fact that the number of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in its patronizing territory was very small, the membership in Missouri being only about six thousand. These conditions neeessarily made the conducting of the *Central Christian Advocate* a very difficult task, and for some time during the first months of the war it was rather doubtful whether it could live under these adverse conditions.

Early in 1861 it was stated that "the religious services of the Methodist Episcopal Church are mostly suspended outside of St. Louis, and that the ministers were temporarily leaving the State." Indeed, plans were made early in 1861 by the Book Agents at Cincinnati to have "the books of the *Central Christian Advocate* and all movables pertaining to the office brought to that city," and made the proposition to divide the subscription list between the *Western* and the *Northwestern Advocates.* To this plan the plucky editor, who was then nearly seventy years of age, refused to agree, saying "he would defend the books with pistols till the last moment." The editor had, however, made arrangements to issue his paper from Alton or Springfield, Ill., if he should find St. Louis untenable.[25]

The editor of the *Central* was Dr. Charles Elliott, who had been placed in this position by the General Conference of 1860. He had had considerable experience in editorial work, having been for twenty-five years connected with the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate,* and had also written extensively on the anti-slavery contest in the Church. Though old in years, he still had plenty of the fire of youth remaining, and conducted his paper in this critical period and under these peculiarly diffi-

[25] *Central Christian Advocate,* May 29, 1861. Quoted in *Zion's Herald,* June 5, 1861.

cult circumstances with skill and with no semblance of fear.

To show the attitude of this paper and the spirit of its editor, I quote the following. On April 17, 1861, the editor wrote an open letter to Hon. Simon Cameron, Secretary of War, calling to his attention certain facts, and offering some suggestions on the approaching crisis in Missouri.[26] Among other things he said: "We have an avowed secessionist governor, we have a Legislature largely secessionist, too. There is a formidable military organization (the Minutemen) numbering now some twenty-three hundred." He then goes on to state that "there is no more loyal people in the Union than the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church—I say nothing of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South . . . and also that Union men of all denominations and politics are ready to enroll themselves in a home corps." The letter closes by the editor introducing himself to Mr. Cameron in these words: "I am a stranger to you, but I will introduce myself and refer you to my friends Secretary Chase and Comptroller Whittlesey for information. I am an itinerant preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church. . . . I am now in my sixty-ninth year. I will enroll myself in the Union company, as I want to die under the Stars and Stripes, and never succumb to a foreign flag, especially the rebel palmetto one."

In this issue of the *Central* a week after the firing on Sumter[27] this editorial appeared: "If war must come, let Christian men be ready to sustain the authority and power of the United States Government. The secessionists have thrown to the winds Democracy, Whiggery, Americanism, and other distinctions. Let the Union men as far as possible ignore technical Democracy and Republicanism, and cling to the National motto,

[26] *Central; Zion's Herald,* June 19, 1861.
[27] *Central,* April 17, 1861.

E Pluribus Unum, one and indivisible, now and always. We cry out to all good citizens and Christians of every name and sect, 'Union! Union! Union!'" Again, in one of the issues early in 1862,[28] the editor states: "We throw out the gospel flag to the friends of the Union and of the Methodist Episcopal Church. We do not wish to have a dollar from any disunionist until he is converted."

The whole Church in the North was interested in sustaining the *Central Christian Advocate,* and saw the importance of keeping alive such a journal in St. Louis. Appeals for the *Central* appeared at various times in the other Church papers,[29] and a number of Conferences passed resolutions concerning it, the following from the Troy Conference being typical:

> Your committee learn with sorrow that in consequence of the ravages of civil war within the bounds of its patronizing territory the conditions and necessities of the *Central Christian Advocate* are such that its life is greatly imperiled. We believe that the discontinuance of that excellent journal at this time would be a calamity to the Nation as well as to the Church. The territory in which it circulates, once wrongfully wrested from the Methodist Episcopal Church, is destined soon to be restored. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is so fully identified with the rebellion that its influence over the lovers of our National Union is doubtless gone forever. It would seem, therefore, that the influence of that noble pioneer *Advocate* was never more needed than at the present.
>
> We commend the adoption of the following resolutions:
>
> *Resolved,* That we have watched with interest and deep solicitude the course of the *Central Christian Advocate* while battling manfully for God and our country in these trying times.

[28] *Ibid,* 1862; quoted in *Christian Advocate,* Feb. 20, 1862.

[29] *Western,* March 12, 1862; *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Feb. 20, 1862; *ibid,* March 13, 1862.

Resolved (2), That Brother J. W. Carhart be appointed to solicit subscriptions to the *Central* among the preachers of the Conference.[30]

Early in 1862 the agents of the Western Methodist Book Concern, and the several editors connected therewith, also adopted resolutions concerning sustaining the *Central Christian Advocate,* and also appointed a committee to prepare an appeal for it to be sent throughout the Church.[31]

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate,* published in Chicago, also occupied a strategic position, being in the very center of the great Northwest, large numbers of whose citizens became hostile to the administration during the course of the war. Dr. T. M. Eddy, the war editor of this journal, was a vigorous writer, and his editorials leave no doubt as to his position on public questions. In the issue of January 2, 1861, just after President Buchanan had announced that the Executive had no power to coerce a State, he points out the two courses open to the United States Government. The first, a stern refusal to permit secession; and the enforcement of the Federal laws at all hazards. This course, he states, will probably lead to civil war. The second course is "to permit the Cotton States to secede peaceably, thus conceding the right of States to retire at will." Of these two courses, the editor says, he believes the first is demanded "by the original compact, by the obligation of the Executive, the welfare of our people, and the accomplishment of our National mission. . . . Senators Douglas and Johnson have taken the true position when they declare it is better to sacrifice a million lives than to submit to treason, for which secession is only a synonym."[32]

In another long editorial in the fall of 1861, on "The

[30] Troy Conference Minutes, 1862, p. 38.
[31] Adopted at Chicago, Feb. 19, 1862; *Western,* March 5, 1862.
[32] *Northwestern Christian Advocate,* Jan. 2, 1861.

Northwest and the War," the editor points out that the Northwest is dependent upon keeping the Mississippi open, so that their products of wheat, corn, cattle, and hogs may find a ready market. The question, he says, is one of life or death for the Northwest. "We can not afford a peace on any terms, other than the re-establishment of our National Union."[33] In this same issue is another editorial, on the "Concessions of Peace," in which the editor answers the "men of pro-slavery sympathies," who "cry lustily against war and would have us concede the claims of our Southern brethren." In this article he sums up the concessions the North must make if peace were to be had. (1) All laws forbidding the master to carry slaves across Free States must be abrogated. (2) The right of temporary residents with slaves must be conceded. (3) Slavery must be recognized as having peculiar sacredness. (4) Slavery must be admitted into the Territories. (5) All laws which interfere with the inalienable rights of the sons of the cavaliers to "damn their own Niggers" must be repealed. (6) The Northern conscience must be corrected—the freedom of opinion, the freedom of speech, the freedom of discussion must cease. "We must not think or say or write against slavery." Then he asks: "Having yielded all this, what have we left? Manhood, government, religion all gone, and the mere privilege of subsistence by tolerance? He who can propose peace at such a surrender is only fit to be the body slave of Chestnut or Wigfall."[34]

Again says the *Northwestern:* "We can afford ten years of war if necessary, we can afford to give up each alternate acre of ground and each second foot of town property, we can afford to give each third man, but we can not afford to accept a peace upon any other basis than that of the Union preserved, with equal rights for

[33] *Northwestern,* Oct. 30, 1861.
[34] *Ibid.*

all its citizens." Early in 1861 the editor stated editorially: "And now our duty is clear. The Government must be maintained at any hazard. Let party dissensions be forgotten, and from Eastport to San Francisco let there be but one party; namely, that of devotion to the Government, the honor of our flag, and vindication of right."[35]

That the policy of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* met the approval of the Methodist people in the Northwest is shown by the fact that the year 1860 closed with 13,300 subscribers, and by 1864 the subscription list had increased to 25,000.[36]

Zion's Herald, the independent Methodist journal published in Boston, maintained its reputation for independence during the war, but was not less loyal than the other Methodist journals. Like all the other Methodist papers, it devoted large space to war items and correspondence and frequent patriotic editorials. Its editor, Dr. E. O. Haven, was the cousin of Dr. Gilbert Haven, chaplain of the Eighth Massachusetts, both of whom afterwards became bishops in the Church. The following short extract from an editorial will show the war spirit of *Zion's Herald:* "How can the United States, with any respect for itself as a nation, allow its own disintegration? . . . If there is to be a divorce, let the ceremony be at least as difficult as the marriage contract?"[37]

Other Methodist journals—the *Buffalo, Pittsburgh,* and *Pacific Christian Advocates,* and the German paper, the *Christian Apologist*—were all loyal supporters of the Government and were conducted in a similar manner to the journals already noted. The Buffalo paper in March, 1861, said: "We are gratified to be able to present our readers this early with the inaugural address

[35] Quoted in the *Methodist,* May 4, 1861, from the *Northwestern.*

[36] General Conference Journal, 1860; pp. 397-400; 1864, pp. 335-341.

[37] *Zion's Herald,* April 21, 1861.

in full of President Lincoln. It bears the unmistakable impress of a mind deeply sensible of the weighty responsibilities of the occasion, and a fearless and unchangeable resolution to meet them."[38] This paper headed its editorial column with an engraving of the flag, followed with the motto, "Let the Battle Rage! The Union! The Constitution! Both now and forever!"[39] Again this paper editorially states: "If civil war must come, then we say, Let it be an earnest one! Let the chastening rod descend with a will." The *Pittsburgh Advocate* expressed itself in a similar way on the National issues, and received the approbation of its patronizing Conference for its patriotic stand.[40] Of the *Pacific Christian Advocate* and its editor we find this statement: "The talented editor of the *Pacific Advocate* finds treason in Oregon. His noble and patriotic stand for the Union is worthy the support of all loyal Americans."[41] The *Christian Apologist* deserves mention for its patriotic influence among German Methodists. The *Ladies' Repository* also, though purely a literary journal, had frequent editorials indicative of patriotism[42] and loyalty.

Of the Methodist press as a whole a journal of another denomination stated in December, 1861: "The masses of the Methodists on this side of Mason and Dixon's line are loyal to the country, and are excelled in their patriotism by no other Christians. The tone of the Methodist press is high; and the *Advocates,* we are glad to say, without exception give no uncertain sound."[43]

The papers of the Methodist Church South were all supporters of the Confederacy. Among the leading

[38] *Buffalo Christian Advocate,* quoted in *Christian Advocate,* March 14, 1861.

[39] *The Methodist,* May 4, 1861.

[40] Minutes of the Pittsburgh Conference, 1863, p. 21.

[41] *Western Christian Advocate,* July 4, 1861.

[42] *Ladies' Repository,* April, 1861; *ibid,* Aug., 1861, p. 512.

[43] *Religious Telescope,* quoted by *Christian Advocate,* Dec. 5, 1861.

journals were the *Nashville Christian Advocate,* the *St. Louis Christian Advocate,* the *New Orleans* and *Kentucky Advocates.* Of these papers the *Western Christian Advocate* early in 1861 had to say, "In not one single paper of the Church South that reaches this office have we seen a single word from the editors favorable to the Union."[44] Before the war had progressed long, however, most of these papers were compelled to suspend publication, which was also true of the papers of other denominations of the South. Indeed, as early as June, 1861, the following Southern Baptist papers had suspended publication: The *Western Watchman,* of St. Louis; the *Southern Baptist,* Charleston, S. C.; the *Virginia Baptist;* the *Baptist Messenger,* Memphis, Tenn.; the *Northwestern Virginia Baptist,* and the *Baptist Standard,* of Nashville.[45]

Another matter in reference to the Church periodicals in connection with the war which ought not to be omitted was their large circulation among the soldiers and throughout the armies. The furnishing of good reading matter for the soldiers found early advocates, dating from the very beginning of the war, and the Church papers immediately took up the matter. In December, 1861, a chaplain writes: "I thank you from my heart for the *Christian Advocate and Journal.* It sheds a glorious and wholesome influence among us. I do n't see how I could dispense with it."[46] Most of the papers offered a special rate to soldiers, covering only the cost, and appeals from time to time appeared in their columns asking their readers to send the papers to their friends in the army. One such appeal states, in part: "In many cases a number of soldiers have gone from the same town or neighborhood. The citizens of such a town or neighborhood might collect what money

[44] *Western,* March 6, 1861. [45] *Zion's Herald,* June 12, 1861.

[46] *Christian Advocate,* December 19, 1861; also *ibid,* Oct. 23, 1863, and Feb. 12, 1862.

they could for this object, and the papers can be sent all in one package to the company or regiment."[47] Many Churches and Conferences took up this matter, and considerable money was collected for this purpose. Thus a Church in Lebanon, Ill., sent $50 to have five thousand copies of the *Western Christian Advocate* sent to the army; and another Church, in Windham, Ohio, sent $23 for the same purpose.[48] The ladies of Ferguson Township, Center County, Pa., sent $12 to supply the Forty-fifth Pennsylvania Regiment with the *Christian Advocate and Journal.*

The Cincinnati Conference at its session in 1863 passed the following resolutions relative to supplying the soldiers with religious reading, which are typical of those passed by other Conferences:

WHEREAS, A large proportion of our citizen soldiery now in the field are either members of the Methodist Episcopal Church or have been reared Methodistically;

Resolved, That it is the duty of the Church to furnish them with such religious reading as will both interest and profit them in their hours of privation, endurance, and loneliness in the camp and hospital;

Resolved, That this is a most successful way to keep up the animus of the army and make it invincible to the enemy;

Resolved, That the Cincinnati Annual Conference recommend the pastors of the various English Churches in its bounds to take up collections as early as October, to purchase religious literature for our brave soldiers; and

WHEREAS, The United States Christian Commission is the speediest way of communication with our soldiers, and has received the approval and sanction of the President and Government officials;

Resolved, That the funds so collected be forwarded to W. T. Perkins, Cincinnati, treasurer of the Western branch of the Christian Commission;

[47] *Ibid.*
[48] *Western,* Dec. 2, 1863.

Resolved, That this Conference heartily approve the proposal of the Book Agents at Cincinnati and New York to sell at one-half the published prices Methodist books and periodicals, for circulation among our soldiers in army and navy.[49]

Zion's Herald was particularly active in this matter, and in almost every issue collections for this purpose from the various Churches are noted. In the issue of June 19, 1861, appears this item:

We have received the following sums to pay for the *Herald* to be sent to the soldiers:

Collection, Malden, Mass.....	$7 00
Individual subscriptions	6 00

Again, in the July 3d (1861) issue:

Collections in New Hampshire Conference	$22 05
Wesley Church, Bath, Maine.....	6 35
Individual subscriptions	16 00

The German weekly, the *Apologist,* was also active in this matter. Dr. Wm. Nast, the editor in 1861, was trying to raise $1,000 for the distribution of the *Apologist* among the German soldiers. His appeal closes with: "Our plan is to make up $1,000 as a fund for sending the *Apologist* into the different regiments. The Germans have already taken about $300 worth of shares. Who will help us?"[50]

The Tract Society was also active in sending their publication, *Good News,* to the army. In 1863[51] it is stated that about five thousand copies of this paper were sent regularly for distribution among the soldiers and sailors, and the publishers reported in 1864 that "50,000 copies go monthly to the army and navy."[52]

[49] Minutes Cincinnati Conference, 1863, p. 33.
[50] *Western,* Oct. 23, 1861; also *Christian Advocate,* Nov. 14, 1861.
[51] *Christian Advocate,* March 26, 1863.
[52] General Conference Journal, 1864, p. 336.

Methodist Episcopal Church and Civil War.

Another fact which ought to be noted in this connection is that at the General Conference of 1864 three of the war editors of Methodist journals were elected to the episcopate—Dr. Edward Thomson, of the *Christian Advocate and Journal;* Dr. Charles Kingsley, of the *Western;* and Dr. D. W. Clark, editor of the *Ladies' Repository*—and later Dr. E. O. Haven, of *Zion's Herald.* This fact is certainly indicative of the general approval of the Church of the way in which these editors had conducted these Methodist papers during the trying times of the war.

CHAPTER VII.

Methodist Chaplains in the Union Armies.

THE need of chaplains in the army was early recognized by the War Department. Less than a month after the first call for troops by President Lincoln, a general order was issued by the War Department, May 4, 1861, stating that one chaplain would be allowed to each regiment, who should be appointed by the regimental commander, on the vote of the various officers of the regiment. This order also stated that the chaplain must be a regularly ordained minister and should receive the pay and allowance of a captain of cavalry.[1]

During the progress of the war numerous other orders were issued, and several Acts of Congress passed, bearing upon the subject of chaplains. On August 19, 1861, Congress passed an act "providing for the better organization of the military establishment." Section 7 of this act refers to chaplains, ratifying the order of May 4th, but leaving the method of their selection to the President. This act specifically states, also, that none but regularly ordained ministers of some Christian denomination shall be eligible.[2]

It was early brought to the attention of the President "by Christian ministers and other pious people"[3] that chaplains simply for the regiments were not sufficient, but that they were especially needed at the hospitals, for the sick and wounded soldiers. The President fully recognized this need, and appointed a number of chaplains for hospital service, stating, however, in his letter

[1] "Official Records," III, vol. ii, p. 154.
[2] *Ibid,* Series III, vol. i, p. 398.
[3] *Ibid,* p. 721.

appointing them, that there was no law conferring the power upon him to appoint them, but he asks them to "voluntarily enter upon and perform the appropriate duties of such position," promising that he will "recommend that Congress make compensation therefor at the same rate as chaplains in the army."[4] The President, true to his promise, in his message to Congress, December 3, 1861, calls attention to the need of chaplains for hospitals, and recommends that the men who are already engaged in hospital service as chaplains be compensated the same as chaplains in the army, and also that provision be made for providing regular hospital chaplains.[5] In this simple recommendation we catch a glimpse of the great heart of the President, who, while he is considering the great affairs of State, yet does not forget the sick and wounded soldiers languishing in the hospitals. Following this recommendation of the President's, Congress on May 20, 1862, passed an act legalizing the action of the President and providing a chaplain for each permanent hospital.[6]

The war had not been in progress very long before some discreditable facts were brought to light regarding the appointment of chaplains. As early as August 1, 1861, it was learned that certain men had received appointments as chaplains who had never been recognized by any Church as ministers.[7] In one instance, it is said, an actor bore the name, received the pay of chaplain, and in another regiment a French cook was mustered as a chaplain in order to meet the expense of keeping him.[8] The paymaster general of the army, Benjamin F. Larned, in a letter to Senator Henry Wilson, December 5, 1861, says regarding this state of affairs: "I re-

[4] "Official Records," III, vol. i, p. 271.

[5] "Papers and Messages of the Presidents," Richardson, vol. vi. p. 48; also "Official Records," III, vol. i, p. 712.

[6] *Ibid,* III, vol. ii, p. 67.

[7] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Aug. 1, 1861.

[8] "Official Records," III, vol. i, p. 72.

gret to say that very many holding this position are utterly unworthy, and while I would not deprive our regiments of the service of a minister of the gospel, I think none should be appointed who did not come recommended by the highest ecclesiastical authority with which they are connected."

The Methodist Episcopal Church was not entirely free from the taint of this disgraceful condition. It seems that certain local preachers (lay preachers) of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in Pennsylvania especially, had obtained ordination at the hands of an independent Congregational Church, for the sole purpose of becoming chaplains in the army.[9] This action, however, was denounced by the authorities of the Church and by the Church periodicals. On February 10, 1862, the Methodist preachers of Philadelphia and vicinity passed resolutions condemning this action of the local preachers and declaring that the Methodist Episcopal Church was not responsible for, and could not recognize, their ordination as ministers of the Church.[10]

In order to safeguard the office of chaplain from being held by such unworthy persons, Congress on July 17, 1862, passed an act declaring that no person shall be made a chaplain "who is not a regularly ordained minister of some religious denomination and who does not present testimonials of his present good standing, with recommendations for his appointment as an army chaplain from some authorized ecclesiastical body or from not less than five accredited ministers belonging to said religious denomination."[11] This act also fixes the compensation of all chaplains "in the regular or volunteer service or army hospitals at one hundred dollars per month, and two rations per day." Just how much influence the pay exercised in inducing ministers

[9] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Feb. 20, 1862.
[10] Minutes Philadelphia Preachers' Meeting, Feb. 10, 1862.
[11] "Official Records," Series III, vol. ii, p. 278.

to enter the army as chaplains would be difficult to determine; but, considering the hardships and the danger they would be compelled to undergo, it would not seem that one hundred dollars per month would offer much inducement. However, it is true that, in the Methodist Episcopal Church at least, during the war the supply of ministers was greater than the demand, and at most of the Annual Conferences candidates for the ministry were rejected for want of Churches to which to send them.[12] Doubtless some of these young men's spiritual ears were rendered a little more acute to the call of the ministry because of the prospect of gaining a chaplaincy.

On April 9, 1864, Congress approved another act, determining the rank of the chaplain.[13] It stated that he should be placed on the rolls next after the surgeon. At the opening of the war the Government was new at the business of organizing regiments and getting them properly officered, and the office of chaplain seemed to puzzle them more than any other. Some thought that the chaplain was not an officer in the generally accepted military sense, while others held that the chaplain held a separate rank entirely,[14] and it was not until this act of April 9, 1864, that the rank of chaplain was clearly determined. Section 2 of this act fixes a disability pension of twenty dollars per month for chaplains, and Sections 3 and 4 prescribe his duties. He was to make monthly reports to the adjutant general of the army regarding the moral condition of the men under his care; he was to hold appropriate religious services at the burial of soldiers, and the act also prescribed that he should conduct public religious services at least once each Sabbath, when practicable.

So much for the acts and orders regulating chaplains.

---

[12] *Western Christian Advocate,* May 21, 1862.

[13] "Official Records," Series III, vol. iv, pp. 227-228.

[14] *Ibid,* pp. 809, 1207.

Methodist Chaplains in the Union Armies.

We now turn to a consideration of Methodist Episcopal chaplains in particular.

The Methodist Episcopal Church at the very beginning of the war indicated her willingness to co-operate with the Government in supplying chaplains for the army and navy. Various organizations of Methodist ministers,[15] as well as many individual ministers,[16] early expressed willingness to serve as chaplains. The bishops also stated on various occasions their willingness to relieve such ministers from their Churches and appoint them as chaplains in the army.[17] In Philadelphia a committee of preachers was appointed to receive the names of those who should volunteer to go as chaplains, and to confer with the governor of the State in regard to their appointment.[18] Similar action was also taken by the Methodist preachers of Boston. At a meeting of the Preachers' Meeting of Boston and Vicinity in August, 1862, a motion was made that the governor be informed "that several of the Methodist clergymen of this vicinity are ready to enter the army as chaplains."[19] It is stated on good authority that Rev. Gilbert Haven, of the New England Conference, was the first chaplain commissioned in the war.[20] In most instances, however, the chaplain was selected directly by the regiment, and a chaplain's selection would therefore depend upon his patriotism and his popularity with the officers and men of that particular regiment. In very many instances where a considerable number of the rank and file were members or attendants of a certain Church, they would very naturally select the minister of that Church as their chaplain. In a few instances ministers enlisted

[15] Minutes Philadelphia Preachers' Meeting, April 29, 1861.
[16] *Christian Advocate and Journal*, May 2, 1861.
[17] Minutes Philadelphia Preachers' Meeting, May 20, 1861.
[18] *Ibid*, May 6, 1861.
[19] Minutes Methodist Preachers' Meeting of Boston, August, 1862.
[20] Minutes New England Conference, 1896, pp. 130, 131.

as privates, and were afterwards seleeted by their regiments as ehaplains.

I have found no little diffieulty in eompiling a list of Methodist ehaplains who served during the war. I have succeeded, however, in making a list that is practically eomplete. This list has been obtained by going through the lists of appointments of the various Conferenees for the four years of the war.[21] By this method four hundred and forty-two names were obtained. The list has been made more eomplete by a eareful search through the files of the Church periodieals, for the war, espeeially the *Christian Advocate and Journal* and the *Western Christian Advocate.* A number of names would not appear in the list of Conferenee appointments as chaplains for the reason that many served as ehaplains less than a year, and if their term of serviee happened to come between Conferences their names would not appear in the Conferenee appointments.

Doubtless a number are omitted in the following list, but I am eertain the number is not large.

The list, by Conferenecs, is as follows:

Baltimore	2	Iowa	17
Black River	8	Kansas	11
Central German	1	Kentucky	4
Central Illinois	13	Maine	4
Central Ohio	13	Michigan	8
Cincinnati	21	Minnesota	10
Des Moines	2	Missouri and Arkansas	13
Detroit	12	Nebraska	1
East Baltimore	17	Newark	12
East Genesee	6	New England	10
East Maine	9	New Hampshire	10
Erie	10	New Jersey	11
Genesee	10	New York	8
Holston	1	New York East	2
Illinois	21	North Indiana	13
Indiana	21	North Ohio	12

[21] Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, 1861-1865, 3 vols.

Northwest Indiana	11	Southern Illinois	17
Northwest Wisconsin	4	Troy	10
Ohio	17	Upper Iowa	2
Oneida	6	Vermont	7
Philadelphia	21	West Iowa	2
Pittsburgh	18	West Wisconsin	5
Providence	5	West Virginia	13
Rock River	13	Wisconsin	5
Southeast Indiana	9	Wyoming	6

This list totals 487 names, and in addition to these there are seventeen or twenty names not listed under any Conference, including Bishop Ames, who was appointed chaplain of an Indiana regiment, and several local preachers, who obtained a chaplaincy in a legitimate manner, and also several loyal ministers from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at least nine from Kentucky, two from Virginia, and two or more from Missouri. The total number of Methodist chaplains who served in the Union armies during the War of the Rebellion can be safely put at 510.

There were four Conferences which furnished twenty or more chaplains: the Cincinnati, Illinois, Indiana, and Philadelphia; and five Conferences which furnished fifteen or more: the East Baltimore, Iowa, Pittsburgh, Ohio, and Southern Illinois. It is interesting to note that these Conferences, furnishing the largest number of Methodist chaplains, were, with the exception of the Iowa, near the seat of the war. The four States furnishing the largest number were: Illinois, 64; Ohio, 63; Indiana, 54; and Pennsylvania, 54; these four States alone furnishing 235, or nearly half the total number. It is also interesting to note the large number, comparatively, furnished by the small Border Conferences: West Virginia, 13; Missouri and Arkansas, 13; Kansas, 11; and Kentucky, which only had nineteen preachers in all, in 1861, furnished four.

As a general rule the chaplains were faithful in the performance of their duties. In many instances a Regi-

mental Church[22] was formed, which held regular services; and where a regiment remained long in camp the chaplain usually improved the time by holding a revival meeting. At the close of such a meeting in an Indiana regiment[23] forty-eight soldiers were received into the regimental Church. In a New York regiment a revival meeting was kept up thirty nights in succession in a tent furnished for that purpose by General Hunter, and one hundred and twenty-five soldiers professed conversion. The chaplain stated that, as a result of the meetings, there had been a perfect revolution in the regiment, and that profanity had nearly ceased.[24] In an Ohio regiment, whose colonel was a well-known Methodist preacher, Colonel Granville Moody, a regimental Church was formed called the "Church of the Living God," and at one of the evening services of this soldiers' Church the colonel himself baptized nine soldiers.[25] Another chaplain, of a Pennsylvania regiment, reports that within a week he baptized twenty-eight soldiers from his regiment. Instances of this kind were not at all uncommon, as the files of the various Church papers for the war bear witness, for in almost every issue are accounts of some such religious meeting as I have described.

Many of the chaplains kept their friends in the North informed as to what was going on in their regiments, through letters written to the Church papers.[26] Some of the chaplains were regular correspondents, and their communications were given prominent places in the papers. Through these letters the chaplains also made known the needs of the men under their care, and made appeals for such things as tents for services, literature

[22] *Zion's Herald,* Nov. 13, 1861.

[23] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Nov. 7, 1861.

[24] *Ibid,* March 26, 1862.

[25] *Western Christian Advocate,* Feb. 19, 1862.

[26] *Ibid,* Oct. 23, 1861; Nov. 27, 1862, etc.; and also the files of all the other Church papers.

for the men, and other provisions and comforts. The chaplains were also the distributing agents for the American Bible Society, the Tract Society, and the various commissions.[27] If he was faithful in his work, the chaplain had more than he could attend to, holding the required services, tending the sick, comforting those boy soldiers who were homesick and disheartened, distributing good reading matter, and a hundred other duties, all of which contributed to the effectiveness of the army. A number of chaplains after retiring from the army became special agents of the Christian Commission or Bible Society, or missionaries to the South or to the freedmen.

[27] *Western Christian Advocate,* Jan. 15, 1862.

CHAPTER VIII.

The War Bishops.

In 1861 the Methodist Episcopal bishops and their residences were as follows:

Thomas A. Morris.....Springfield, Ohio.
E. S. Janes.....New York.
Levi Scott .....Wilmington, Del.
Matthew Simpson.....Evanston, Ill.
O. C. Baker.....Concord, N. H.
Edward R. Ames.....Indianapolis, Ind.

The Methodist bishops had no settled territory over which they presided, but traveled from one end of the country to the other in the regular performance of their duties. This brought them in direct contact with all sections of the country and made them familiar with all shades of opinion in respect to loyalty or disloyalty to the United States Government, and it also gave them great opportunities of being of service to the country in regard to stirring up patriotism among the people. To indicate the wide range of territory covered by a Methodist bishop in the course of but a single year, I give this table showing the itinerary of the six bishops for the year 1863 by Conferences:

Bishop Morris...	Kentucky	Feb. 26-28.
	West Virginia	Mar. 18-23.
	North Indiana	Apr. 9-13.
	North Ohio	Sept. 2-7.
	Indiana	Sept. 16-21.
	Northwest Indiana	Sept. 30-Oct. 5.
Bishop Janes...	Pittsburgh	Mar. 18-23.
	Providence	Mar. 27-Apr. 1.
	Wyoming (Pa.)	Apr. 9-13.
	Black River (N. Y.)	Apr. 15-23.
	Oregon	Aug. 12-17.
	California	Sept. 2-8.

The War Bishops.

Bishop Scott	East Baltimore	Mar. 4-11.
	New Jersey	Mar. 18-20.
	New England	Apr. 1-7.
	New York	Apr. 15-22.
	East Genesee (N. Y. and Pa.)	Sept. 9-14.
	Central Illinois	Sept. 15-21.
	Rock River (Ill.)	Sept. 23-28.
	Wisconsin	Oct. 1-6.
	Illinois	Oct. 8-14.
Bishop Simpson	Baltimore	Mar. 4-10.
	Philadelphia	Mar. 18-27.
	Vermont	Apr. 15-20.
	Maine	Apr. 22-27.
	East Maine	Apr. 29-May 4.
	Erie (Pa. and Ohio)	July 15-21.
	West Wisconsin	Sept. 2-7.
	Central Ohio	Sept. 9-14.
	Detroit	Sept. 16-22.
	Michigan	Sept. 23-29.
	Genesee (N. Y.)	Oct. 1-7.
Bishop Baker	Newark (N. J.)	Mar. 25-31.
	New York East	Apr. 1-7.
	New Hampshire	Apr. 8-13.
	Troy (N. Y.)	Apr. 15-21.
	Oneida (N. Y.)	Apr. 22-24.
	Cincinnati (Ohio)	Sept. 2-9.
	Ohio	Sept. 9-14.
	Southeastern Indiana	Sept. 16-21.
	Southern Illinois	Sept. 23-26.
Bishop Ames	Missouri and Arkansas	Mar. 4- .
	Kansas	Mar. 11-16.
	Nebraska	Mar. 25-29.
	Rocky Mountain	July 10-13.
	Western Iowa	Sept. 2-5.
	Iowa	Sept. 9-15.
	Upper Iowa	Sept. 16-21.
	Minnesota	Sept. 30-Oct. 3.
	Southwest Wisconsin	Oct. 7-10.

Every year the itinerary of each bishop was changed, so that during the five years of the war each Bishop visited practically every State in the North. For instance, Bishop Simpson from 1861 to 1865 held Conferences in twenty-one Northern States.[1]

[1] General Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1861-1865, 3 vols.

It is the intention of this chapter to show that these six war bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church exercised an important and far-reaching influence in the interest of loyalty and patriotism. Every one of the six was unquestionably loyal from the outbreak of the war and, as the war progressed, became increasingly so.

Bishop Morris, the senior bishop, lived in Springfield, Ohio. He was considerably older than the other bishops, and was therefore relieved of some of the heavier duties attendant upon his office by his younger colleagues, but he seems to have never failed to lift his voice in favor of the preservation of the Union and against slavery whenever the opportunity presented itself. One of the Church periodicals stated in 1861 that "the star-spangled banner was continuing to wave from the flagstaff of our venerable senior bishop, Thomas A. Morris."[2] At the session of the Erie Conference in the fall of 1861, over which Bishop Morris presided, when the report on the State of the Country was read, and a motion was offered to send a copy of the resolutions to President Lincoln, Bishop Morris remarked, "with his characteristic good feeling, 'That 's right, give "Old Abe" a lift.' "[3]

In 1863 Bishop Morris presided at the Western Virginia Conference, and in an address before that body stated that he was a native of Western Virginia, which he deemed far higher honor than to be a native of the "Old Dominion," for the Old Dominion was now in rebellion, and he was for the Union, without any ifs or ands or buts.[4]

The next bishop in order of seniority was Edmund S. Janes, whose residence was New York City. During the first year of the war Bishop Janes was visiting the Methodist missions in Western Europe. Soon after the inauguration of President Lincoln, the bishop refers to

[2] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* June 6, 1861.

[3] *Ibid,* September 12, 1861.

[4] *Western Christian Advocate,* April 15, 1863.

the oncoming struggle in a letter written to one of his children. He says: "I expect you have heard the drum very often lately. I am sorry men will be so wicked as to make it necessary to fight. Our beloved country is passing through great trials. I believe Providence will take care of our noble, free institutions. I expect the world will sing 'Hail! Columbia!' many generations hence."[5] During his absence in Europe, and especially in England, Bishop Janes was enabled to perform some patriotic service for his distracted country. His biographer states that "in his public addresses and private conversations he did not lose sight of the one absorbing topic of the hour with every American, at home and abroad. He did all he could to promote a correct understanding of the great controversy between the North and the South."[6] In a letter to the bishop soon after his return to America, Dr. John McClintock, who was then pastor of the American Church in Paris, wrote: "Your services in England were exceedingly useful, both to our Church and to the country. The appreciation of them in the newspapers is flattering to you."[7]

The following is a partial report of a speech the bishop delivered in Newcastle, England.[8] Referring to the war now being waged in the United States, he said: "This question . . . is one which, I think, claims the sympathy, interest, and prayers of all philanthropists, and I believe I am justified in saying that in the United States one of the principal apprehensions they have felt has been that there might be an unhappy influence on the question from this country. We know that Victoria was queen, but some claim that Cotton was king, even in England. (Cries of 'No, No.') Very well, if you do n't acknowledge his authority, all right. I ought to

[5] "Life of Bishop Janes," Ridgeway, pp. 248, 249.
[6] "Life of Bishop Janes," Ridgeway, p. 251.
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* August 22, 1861. Copied from the *Northern Daily Press* (England).

say that this apprehension has been lessened very much by the recent action of the Government and the tone of your public press."

In this connection I will mention the patriotic services of Dr. John McClintock, in Paris. Though not a bishop, he was a minister of great influence and high standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the service he performed during his residence in Paris was considerable.

Just before the outbreak of the war Dr. McClintock had become the pastor of the American Church in Paris. His biographer states that "in all the dark period from 1861 to 1863 his voice rang out clear in its predictions of our final success, his courage made others courageous, his hopefulness gave others hope."[9]

In April, 1861, Dr. McClintock delivered an address before the Wesleyan Missionary anniversary in Exeter Hall, London, in which he took occasion to say: "The *Times* said, the day before yesterday, just in the words that I will now quote, 'The great Republic is no more.' Shall I go home and tell my friends that I don't know whether you believe with the *Times* or not? I am inclined to think you do not; but if you have the slightest disposition to believe any such doctrine as that, let me tell you, 'Lay not the flattering unction to your souls.' No, I don't believe that Britons will rejoice to see the day when the 'great Republic' shall be no more. (Tremendous cheering.) But if they shall, let me tell you the day of their rejoicing is very far away." Further on in this happy speech he says: "Suppose that we in New York, editing papers . . . at the time of your rebellion in the East Indies, should have made use of such an expression as that. I am not afraid of talking about the *Times* because I am not an Englishman, and if we had printed for two or three days that Great Britain was no

[9] "Life and Letters of the Rev. Dr. McClintock," Crooks, p. 284.

more, and that the diadem was about to fall from the head of Victoria because there was a rebellion in India, it would have been quite a parallel case. . . .

"Now let me say to you, Mr. President, and this vast audience of Wesleyan ministers, and good, sensible, intelligent people, do not let your political newspapers or your politicians debauch your intellects or morals upon the present exciting American question. For the first time in the whole history of the human race a people to the extent of twenty millions have risen up to say, 'We will forfeit our prestige before the world; we will jeopard our name even as a great republic; we will run the risk even of a terrible civil war such as the world has never seen; we will do all this sooner than we will suffer that human slavery should be extended one inch.' (Tremendous cheering.) I am in earnest about that point, and I do not want you to forget it; and if you read the *Times* you will need to remember it."[10] . . .

Commenting on the effects of this speech, the London *Watchman* says, "We never before saw Exeter Hall in such a tumult of acclamation."[11]

To speak in detail of the patriotic activity of Dr. McClintock in France and England would occupy too much space in this brief account. His efforts in behalf of his country's cause was not limited to patriotic speeches alone. He translated De Rasparin's book, "The Uprising of a Great People," and published it in London, paying the expense with money sent by friends of New York.[12] He also published in London the speech of Alexander H. Stephens, vice-president of the Confederacy, delivered on March 21, 1861, in which slavery is declared the cornerstone of the new government.[13] The New York *World* also credits him with an article

[10] "Life and Letters of the Rev. Dr. McClintock," Crooks, pp. 285-287. [11] "Life of McClintock," Crooks, p. 287.
[12] *Ibid*, p. 289. [13] *Ibid*, p. 288.

in *L'Ame de la Religion,*[14] a Paris newspaper, in which he vigorously supports the cause of the Union.

In connection with the "Trent affair" Dr. McClintock was also able to render some valuable service to the country. Mr. Thurlow Weed, then in Paris, went over to London to assist in settling the misunderstanding over this affair, and took with him a letter of Dr. McClintock's to Rev. William Arthur, an influential Wesleyan minister, who introduced him to Mr. Kinnaird, M. P., through whom he received early introduction to Lord Palmerston and the Earl of Shaftesbury.[15]

Speaking of the services of Dr. McClintock, the New York *World* says: "What Motley had done in England by his able letter to the London *Times,* Dr. J. McClintock has done and is doing for France. Availing himself of all proper means for instructing the people, not of France alone but of England also, he leaves them no excuse for ignorance of the principles for which we wage our war against armed rebellion. The Doctor has no diplomatic position in the country of his present residence, but his fertile pen and thorough scholarship enable him to do a work for which diplomacy might find itself important in instructing and molding that public opinion which statesmen can not long neglect." . . .

Harper's Weekly has this to say of the services of Dr. McClintock: "One of our most valiant and faithful champions in Europe since the war began is the Rev. Dr. McClintock. . . . The Doctor is a noble-hearted Christian patriot, and his labors have been untiring for the welfare of his country. . . . Through his influence and speeches the great body of the Wesleyans in England have been our firm and steadfast friends."[16]

[14] *Western Christian Advocate,* July 21, 1861. Quoted from New York *World.*

[15] For Mr. Weed's statement see "Life of Dr. McClintock," Crooks, pp. 312, 313. For Dr. McClintock's correspondence with William Arthur see pp. 292-312.

[16] *Harper's Weekly,* May 21, 1864, p. 323.

Of all the Methodist ministers, Bishop Janes and Dr. McClintock rendered the most conspicuous patriotic service abroad.

At home Bishop Janes was especially active in the work of the Christian Commission. He was one of its charter members,[17] and took an active and effective part in the direction of its great work. In December, 1861, he writes from Washington that he has been gathering information "on subjects connected with the Christian Commission,"[18] where he had been sent by the commission to make any necessary arrangements with the Government for the carrying on of the work among the soldiers. He reported to the commission in January, 1862, that he had been well received by the Secretary of War, who gave him the following note:

WASHINGTON CITY, January 24, 1863.

Bishop Janes is authorized to state that he has received assurance from the Secretary of War, that every facility consistent with the exigencies of the service will be afforded to the Christian Commission, for the performance of their religious and benevolent purposes in the armies of the United States, and in the forts, garrisons, and camps, and military posts.

E. M. STANTON.[19]

Again, in June, 1862, he writes: "I have been engaged much of my time with the Christian Commission. We have had three sessions, and have another this evening."[20]

In December, 1864, Bishop Janes, together with Bishop Lee, of Delaware, and Horatio Gates Jones, of Philadelphia, were appointed as a delegation by the Christian Commission to visit the Union prisoners in Southern prisons, in order to distribute "food, clothing, medicines, and religious publications." The consent of

[17] Annals of the Christian Commission, Moss, p. 106.
[18] "Life of Bishop Janes," Ridgeway, p. 251.
[19] Annals of the Christian Commission, Moss, p. 131.
[20] "Life of Bishop Janes," Ridgeway, p. 256.

the War Department and General Grant was readily obtained, and every effort was made by the Federal authorities to assist them to carry out their mission, but the Confederate authorities refused to permit the visit.[21] Bishop Janes remained an executive member of the commission until the war closed, giving to it all the time he could spare from his regular duties.

Bishops Scott and Baker were not so conspicuous in their patriotic activities as perhaps some of the other bishops, although we have an abundance of evidence that they were intensely loyal. In the various Conferences over which they presided they took an active and effective part in any patriotic service or flag-raising,[22] and never missed an opportunity of denouncing secession and slavery.[23]

Of the six war bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Bishops Ames and Simpson undoubtedly ren-

---

[21] For all the correspondence relating to the incident between the Christian Commission and the War Department, and also between the delegates of the commission and the Confederate authorities, see Annals of Christian Commission, Moss, pp. 189-198.

The note informing the committee of the Confederate authorities' refusal to permit the visiting of Union prisoners is as follows:

OFFICE U. S. ASSISTANT AGENT FOR EXCHANGE OF PRISONERS.
FLAG OF TRUCE STEAMER *New York*.
VARINA, JAMES RIVER, VA., Jan. 21, 1865.

Rev. Bishop E. S. Janes, D. D.
Rt. Rev. Bishop Alfred Lee, D. D.
Horatio Gates Jones.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to inform you that I am directed by the Confederate authorities to notify you that they deem it inexpedient to grant your request for permission to visit the Federal prisoners held by them, at this time. Your communication will doubtless be answered by letter at my next interview with the Confederate agent for exchange. If so, I will promptly forward the same to you. I am, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

JNO. E. MULFORD,
Lt. Col. & U. S. Assistant Agent for Exchange.

[22] Minutes New York East Conference, 1863, p. 8.

[23] *Western Christian Advocate*, Oct. 22, 1862.

dered the largest and most effective service for their country. The work of Bishop Simpson is perhaps more widely known than that of Bishop Ames, due, no doubt, to his excellent biography written by Dr. George R. Crooks, and also to the fame which he achieved as an orator and great preacher. But the patriotic work of Bishop Ames was not any less than that of Simpson, and it is unfortunate that no life of him has ever been written.[24]

Bishop Ames lived in Indianapolis during the war, which was the very center of a large and growing Methodist population, and from the opening of the war he took a prominent part in all kinds of patriotic activity. In April, 1861, we find him preaching at Camp Morton before the soldiers[25] and in the course of his sermon uttering these eloquent words: "There has been one grand Union convention, the proceedings of which have not been reported by the telegraph. It was held amid the fastnesses of the everlasting hills. The Rocky Mountains presided and the mighty Mississippi River made the motion and the Allegheny Mountains seconded it, and every mountain and hill and river and valley in this vast country sent up a unanimous voice—*Resolved,* That we are one and inseparable, and what God has joined together no man shall put asunder."

Bishop Ames was the only Methodist bishop who was appointed to the post of chaplain in the army. He became chaplain of an Indiana regiment, and in the fall of 1861 he announced his intention of devoting his attention during the ensuing winter to the moral and religious interests of the soldiers in camp.[26]. This intention he seems to have carried out, for from time to time

[24] The writer made an effort to locate the private papers of Bishop Ames, but all his efforts proved of no avail.

[25] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* May 6, 1861, quoted from the Indiana *American.*

[26] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* Oct. 31, 1861.

during the winter of 1861-62 we find records of his having preached to the soldiers in the various camps and forts.[27]

Not only was Bishop Ames active in serving his country in a private capacity, but on several occasions his services were sought by the United States Government. In January, 1862, Bishop Ames and Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York, were appointed by the War Department as commissioners to visit the Union prisoners at Richmond . . . and elsewhere . . . and relieve their necessities and provide for their comfort, at the expense of the United States.''[28] This appointment was accepted by Bishop Ames, and he immediately made his way to Washington to confer with the Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, regarding his duties as commissioner.[29] The War Department made provision to establish a depot of clothing at Fortress Monroe, to be drawn upon by these commissioners[30] for supplying the wants of the prisoners. The commissioners went immediately to Fortress Monroe and made known their commissions to the Confederate authorities at Norfolk, by whom the matter was referred to Richmond. A reply finally came refusing to admit the commissioners through the Confederate lines,[31] but expressing readiness to negotiate for the general exchange of prisoners. The commissioners then opened negotiations, which resulted in an equal exchange of prisoners. But the Confederates having three hundred more prisoners than the National Government, they proposed to release these on parole if the United States Government would agree to release three

[27] *Ibid*, Feb. 13, 1862.

[28] ''Official Records,'' Series II, vol. iii, p. 113.

[29] *Ibid*, p. 216.

[30] *Ibid*, p. 222. For other orders and correspondence relating to these commissioners see *ibid*, pp. 223-224, 230, 248, 251, 253, 261, 262.

[31] For all Confederate correspondence relating to these negotiations and to this commission see ''Official Records,'' Series II, vol. iii, pp. 786-791, 821, 822.

hundred of their men that might next fall into its hands.[32]

The appointment of this commission, and especially the placing of Bishop Ames upon it, aroused considerable comment in the South. The Norfolk *Day-Book* has this to say of the appointment of this commission: "The exquisite modesty of this proposition to send official inspectors of our defenses and general condition entitle Mr. Stanton to the reputation of being the most impudent man among all King Lincoln's proverbially impudent subjects."[33] Relating to Bishop Ames's appointment, I have found a very interesting letter to Jefferson Davis, written by an officer in the Confederate army, who was also an ex-minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church.[34] He writes this letter to warn Mr. Davis against allowing Bishop Ames to enter the Confederate lines. He says he knows Bishop Ames, and that "he has been for many years a shrewd and patent politician." He then reviews the recent controversy within the Methodist Church, especially along the border, and then states: "In all this protracted controversy Bishop Ames's sympathies, and indeed most of our bishops', were with the North. I know Bishop Ames to be an uncompromising anti-slavery man, not to say abolitionist. He, with other members of the bench of bishops, sought to impress upon the present President of the United States and his Cabinet, upon their accession to power, the fact that the Methodist Church, very numerous in the North and West, had peculiar claims upon the Government for a liberal share of the spoils of office, as they had so largely contributed to Mr. Lincoln's election." Further on he states: "I am positively certain from personal knowledge that Bishop Ames, with many others

[32] Moore's "Rebellion Record," vol. iv, p. 32.

[33] From the issue of January 30, 1862. Moore's "Rebellion Record," vol. iv, p. 18.

[34] For the text of this letter see "Official Records," Series II, vol. iii, p. 787, 788. See Appendix B.

whom I might name of high position in our Church in the North, have aided most fearfully, by the influence of their position and their known sentiments to augment the power of the abolition party in the North.'' And in conclusion he makes this appeal: ''Allow me, in conclusion, Mr. President, to warn you against this astute politician, who in the garb of a Christian minister and with the specious plea of 'Humanity' upon his lips, would insinuate himself into the very heart of that Government whose very foundation he would most gladly sap and destroy.''

Whether this letter had any influence in the decision of the Confederate Government in respect to these commissioners, is impossible to determine, but it serves to show the feeling in the South concerning Bishop Ames and the Methodist Episcopal Church.

That Bishop Ames was trusted by the Federal authorities, and especially by the Secretary of War, is further shown by the fact that in August of 1862 Governor Morton, of Indiana, intrusted him to carry certain important letters to Stanton[35] respecting drafts.

Bishop Ames, like the other bishops, also took a prominent part in the patriotic demonstrations at the various Conferences over which he presided, making patriotic speeches and offering patriotic prayers.[36] In the General Conference of 1864, which met in Philadelphia, he was made chairman of the committee appointed by that body to carry an address to President Lincoln,[37] thus recognizing him as the Church's leader in her patriotic activities.

There remains yet for us to consider Bishop Matthew Simpson's large and important activity in relation to this struggle. In many respects his is the most con-

[35] ''Official Records,'' Series III, vol. ii, p. 375.

[36] Minutes Detroit Conference, 1861; also New York East Conference, 1865, pp. 3, 4.

[37] General Conference Journal, 1864, p. 378. For the address and Lincoln's reply see Chapter IV.

spicuous Methodist name in relation to the war and the Nation. His intimate personal friendship with President Lincoln, and also with other members of the Cabinet, and his overwhelming patriotie eloquenee, has given his name lasting conneetion with the Civil War.

I ean do no better here than to reproduee some of the testimony whieh has been colleeted by Dr. Crooks in his life of Bishop Simpson. The first I quote is from the recollections of Gen. Clinton B. Fisk:

In April, 1861, after the eall for 75,000 men, the bishop met Lineoln in the President's offiee. Several members of the Cabinet dropped in, Bates, Blair, Cameron, and Seward. The bishop expressed the opinion that 75,000 men were but a beginning of the number needed; that the struggle would be long and severe. Mr. Seward asked what opportunity a elergyman eould have to judge such affairs as these. Judge Bates replied that few men knew so mueh of the temper of the people as Bishop Simpson; Montgomery Blair sustained the view of Judge Bates. A Cabinet meeting followed. After it was over, Lincoln and Simpson remained together quite a long time. The bishop gave him, in detail, his opinion of men throughout the eountry whom he knew.

After Mr. Stanton eame into the Cabinet the bishop's relations with the President beeame more intimate. The bishop was used by Mr. Lincoln to modify the war seeretary's views, and to gain points whieh he wished to reaeh. For instanee: Stanton was disposed to treat with great severity the border rebels who stayed at home and gave aid and comfort to the enemy. Lineoln was inclined to treat them leniently. The bishop was of the same mind as the President, and was sent to Stanton to bring him over to the President's way of thinking.

. . . . . .

In the summer of this same year, 1862, the bishop had another interview with Mr. Lincoln, eonfined to the point of the President's duty to issue a proclamation setting the slaves free in the rebellious States. Subsequently Mr. Lineoln showed him the proelamation; the bishop was delighted with it. When it was read in the

Cabinet meeting, Mr. Chase suggested its last sentence. "Why," replied Lincoln, "that is just what Bishop Simpson said." In their interview prior to the meeting of the Cabinet the bishop had suggested that there ought to be a recognition of God in that important paper.[38]

I reproduce also here the personal recollections of Dr. Thomas Bowman, who was chaplain of the Senate in 1864-65, and who writes from personal observation:

In 1864-65, as I spent several months in Washington, I often heard members of Congress and other distinguished visitors in the city say that they had heard the President frequently express his great respect for, and his confidence in, Bishop Simpson. It was well known that the President occasionally sent for the bishop, in order to procure information about the affairs of the Nation. The President said in substance: "Bishop Simpson is a wise and thoughtful man. He travels extensively over the country, and sees things as they are. He has no ax to grind, and therefore I can depend upon him for such information as I need."

On one occasion, with two or three friends, I was conversing with Mr. Lincoln near the distant window in the Blue Room, when unexpectedly the door opened and Bishop Simpson entered. Immediately the President raised both arms and started for the bishop, almost on a run. When he reached him he grasped him with both hands and exclaimed, "Why, Bishop Simpson, how glad I am to see you!" In a few moments we retired, and left them alone. I afterwards learned that they spent several hours in private, and that this was one of the times when the bishop had been specially asked by the President to come to Washington for such an interview.

At another time, under very different circumstances, I had an opportunity to witness the kind feeling which the President evidently cherished for the bishop. Simpson delivered his wonderful lecture on "Our Country" in one of our churches in Washington. Lincoln, without any mark of distinction, was in the great crowd of hearers. I happened to be near him, and could see his

[38] Crooks's "Life of Simpson," pp. 373, 374.

every movement. I never saw a hearer who gave more marked evidence of a personal interest in a speaker than the President gave that evening. He joined most heartily in the frequent and sometimes prolonged applause. At one time, as the bishop was speaking of the wonderful opportunity that our country affords to young men, he paused for a moment, and said, "Why, it is commonly reported that a rail-splitter has been elected President of the United States!" This, of course, brought down the house, and I was particularly pleased to see with what almost boyish enthusiasm the President joined in the tremendous applause.[39]

Bishop Simpson was probably the most eloquent preacher in the Methodist denomination, and deserves to rank with the greatest in the country.

In a sermon delivered in Chicago in the first year of the war, occurs this sentence: "We will take our glorious flag—the flag of our country—and nail it just below the cross! There let it wave, as it waved of old. Around it let us gather: First Christ's, and then our country's."[40]

The most conspicuous oratorical efforts of Bishop Simpson during the war, however, were not sermons, but lectures on patriotic themes. The effect of these lectures upon his hearers was often marvelous. In 1864 he delivered one of his lectures at Elmira, N. Y., and a college president who heard it stated afterwards, "The Government should employ that man to visit all the principal cities in the loyal States and pronounce that discourse; it would bring down the price of gold."[41] *Harper's Weekly* thus describes the effect of his lecture which he delivered in Pittsburgh in October, 1864: "The effect of his discourse is described as very remarkable. Toward the close an eye-witness says: 'Laying his hand on the torn and ball-riddled colors of the

[39] Crooks's "Life of Simpson," pp. 371-373.

[40] *Christian Advocate and Journal,* May 23, 1861.

[41] *Western Christian Advocate,* August 31, 1864.

Seventy-third Ohio, he spoke of the battlefields where they had been baptized in blood, and described their beauty as some small patch of azure, filled with stars, that an angel had snatched from the heavenly canopy to set the stripes in blood. With this description began a scene that Demosthenes might have envied. All over the vast assembly handkerchiefs and hats were waved, and before the speaker sat down the whole throng arose as if by magic influence, and screamed, and shouted, and saluted, and stamped, and clapped, and wept, and laughed in wild excitement. Colonel Moody sprang to the top of a bench and called for "The Star-Spangled Banner," which was sung, or rather shouted, until the audience dispersed.' "[42]

This great speech of Bishop Simpson played a rather conspicuous part in the campaign of 1864. It was arranged to have the lecture delivered in New York just before the Presidential election. Mr. Ward Hoyt, who had the preparation for the meeting in charge, thus writes to Bishop Simpson: "All of your friends agree that you should speak before the election. Speaking at that time, until the full report, promised in the *Tribune, Times, Herald,* and *Evening Post,* is equivalent to speaking to the Nation." The speech was accordingly delivered on November 3, 1864, in the Academy of Music, New York. Of the great mass of people who came to hear it, the New York *Tribune* states: "Such an audience gathered at the Academy of Music as seldom or never before was crowded within its walls. Long before the time announced for the lecture to commence, the spacious building was crowded from pit to dome—the seats were soon filled, the standing room all taken up, and still the crowd poured in till no more room was left in which to squeeze another person."[43]

[42] *Harper's Weekly,* October 15, 1864, p. 659.

[43] New York *Tribune,* Nov. 7, 1864. Quoted in Crooks's "Life of Simpson," pp. 378, 379. For an outline of this great lecture see Appendix C.

That Bishop Simpson was close to President Lincoln is further evidenced by the fact that he was chosen to give the funeral oration over the body of the great martyred President at Springfield, Ill.[44]

During the early part of the war Bishop Simpson lived in Evanston, Ill., but during the last year of the war he changed his residence to Philadelphia. After he took up his residence in Philadelphia he became very actively engaged in the work of the Christian Commission, delivering speeches on several occasions,[45] one of them being the closing anniversary of the commission, where he delivered the closing address.[46] He was also elected one of five trustees to close up the affairs of the commission after its work was completed.

In the General Conference of 1864 there were three new bishops elected: Edward Thomson, Charles Kingsley, and D. W. Clark; but as their work as bishops of the Church covered less than a year of the war, and as the work of each of them in relation to the war has already received full treatment in the chapter on Church Periodicals, I have chosen to conclude the study of the war bishops with Bishop Simpson.

I close this chapter with a quotation from an address by Dr. J. P. Newman, afterwards himself a bishop, delivered in New Orleans, March 22, 1864, in which he makes what Messrs. Nicolay and Hay term a well-founded claim:[47] "The Methodist Church has been unanimous and zealous in the defense of the Union. Her bishops, her ministers, and her laity have nobly responded to the call of their country in this hour of her peril. The voice of Simpson has been heard pleading eloquently for the union of the country. Ames, as patriotic as wise, has not hesitated to lend his aid to our unfortunate pris-

[44] For the funeral oration see Appendix D.

[45] Annals of the Christian Commission, Moss, p. 132.

[46] *Ibid,* pp. 271-279. For the other speeches and proceedings on this occasion, held Feb. 11, 1866, see *ibid,* pp. 234-288.

[47] "Life of Lincoln," Nicolay and Hay, vol. vi, p. 324, Note.

oners in Richmond, and to give his sons to the army. Janes has found no narrow field for his philanthropic heart in the labors of the Christian Commission. All our Church papers and periodicals have given an uncompromising, zealous, persistent support to the Government, and have thrown the whole weight of their influence, intelligent as it was potent, on the side of the Union.''[48]

[48] McPherson's ''Rebellion,'' pp. 523, 524.

CHAPTER IX.

Methodist Co-operation With Interdenominational Organizations.

A STUDY of the activities of a Church in its relation to the Civil War would be incomplete without it takes into consideration some of the great interdenominational, charitable, and semi-religious organizations which sprang up during the war to meet the various needs and emergencies which the new conditions presented. At least three such organizations will be the subject of our consideration in the course of this chapter. They are the United States Christian Commission, the American Bible Society, and the various Freedmen's organizations and commissions, which sprang up in considerable numbers in all parts of the North.

The work of all these various organizations has received full treatment in other places, but the object of this study is to show how individual Churches cooperated with and worked through them.

THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN COMMISSION.

The United States Christian Commission was organized at the Young Men's Christian Association in New York, November 14, 1861.[1] Previous to this the Young Men's Christian Association in the various cities had been active in providing supplies and comforts for the new recruits, and also individual Churches, through their local organizations, had done the same. The idea of uniting these various agencies into one organization was

[1] Annals of the United States Christian Commission, Moss, p. 103.

suggested by Mr. Vincent Collyer, of New York, who had been engaged in this kind of work among the soldiers enlisted in New York City or passing through it on their way to the front.[2]

This organizing convention elected twelve men as a commission, including four ministers, representing the various denominations, Bishop Edmund S. Janes, D. D., of New York, being the Methodist representative.[3] The commission afterwards was enlarged to forty-seven, Bishop Matthew Simpson and General Clinton B. Fisk, besides Bishop Janes, being among the Methodist members of this enlarged commission; these three also being members of the Executive Committee.

The work of the Christian Commission has been fully described in the "Annals of the United States Christian Commission," by Rev. Lemuel Moss, and in "Incidents of the United States Christian Commission," by Rev. Edward P. Smith. During the four years, 1862, '63, '64, and '65, the commission received in cash $2,524,-512.56, most of which was obtained by public collections in churches and at special meetings. The commission sent out its appeal to the ministers and Churches through the Church papers, as the commission published no organ of its own.[4]

As an example of the readiness with which people contributed money to the commission, I relate the following incidents: In the village of Curwensville, Clearfield County, Pa., a meeting was held on Thanksgiving Day, 1863, attended by about 150 people, and addressed by the Methodist minister. A collection was taken for the

[2] "Life of George H. Stuart," R. E. Thompson, p. 129.

[3] Annals of the United States Christian Commission, p. 106. The original members of the commission were Rev. Rollin H. Neale, D. D., and Chas. Demond, Boston; John H. Hill, Buffalo; John V. Farwell, Chicago; Rev. L. M. R. P. Thompson, H. Thane Miller, Cincinnati; Rev. S. H. Tyng, D. D., Benj. F. Manierre, and Rev. Bishop E. S. Janes, New York; Geo. H. Stuart and John P. Crozier, Philadelphia; Mitchell H. Miller, Washington.

[4] *Ibid*, p. 522.

commission amounting to $600, and in the following May another meeting, in the same place, contributed $857.25, and still later a resident of the same village sent $1,000 to the commission.[5] The largest single contribution given to the commission was secured by Rev. C. C. McCabe, a Methodist minister, who had been a chaplain of an Ohio regiment, captured and confined in Libby Prison, and during the closing years of the war acted as an agent of the Christian Commission. This gift amounted to $10,000 and was given by a farmer, Mr. Jacob Straw, of Morgan County, Ill.[6]

Public collections for the commission were quite generally taken in the churches on the several fast and thanksgiving days which were observed during the war. The receipts from Thanksgiving collections in November, 1863, alone, amounted to $83,400.[7]

The Churches not only co-operated with the commission by giving liberally toward its support, but also by sending "delegates" into the field. Delegate was the name given a person sent out to the army by the Christian Commission. Their duties were to visit "hospitals, camps, and battlefields for the instruction, supply, and encouragement and relief of the men of our army according to their various circumstances; distributing stores where needed in hospitals and camps; circulating good publications amongst our soldiers and sailors; aiding chaplains in looking after the spiritual welfare of the men in camp and in the hospitals; encouraging and helping soldiers to communicate with their friends, and, if necessary, writing for them; discouraging vice of every kind. They were also to aid surgeons on the battlefield by removing the wounded and giving them food and drink, giving them religious comfort if dying,

[5] Moss, pp. 524, 525.

[6] *Ibid*, p. 525. Chaplain McCabe tells how he obtained this large gift in "Life of McCabe," Bristol, pp. 175-180. Taken from McCabe's Journal.

[7] Moss, p. 525.

and to see that the dead had Christian burial.[8] I find the following in the Minutes of the Philadelphia Preachers' Meeting in 1862: "A request from George R. Stuart was read, asking that ministers and laymen volunteer to go to the seat of war near Washington to minister to the sick and wounded." The Minutes record that a committee was then appointed to confer with Mr. Stuart (president of the Christian Commission), and also that fifteen ministers offered themselves to go to the front.

These delegates volunteered their services and worked without pay. Among them were a large number of ministers, representing all Protestant communions. These ministerial "delegates" were called chaplains by the soldiers, and they performed very much the same sort of service as a chaplain; they held religious services, distributed tracts and other religious literature; comforted the dying, and buried the dead. The number of ministers from the Methodist Episcopal Church who served as delegates under the Christian Commission during the war is as follows:

1862	20
1863	77
1864	244
1865	117
Total	458[9]

The Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church co-operated with the United States Christian Commission in furnishing tracts for distribution among the soldiers and sailors. I quote from the Report of the Committee on Tracts of the Cincinnati Conference for 1862, to show the increased effort made by the Church to meet

[8] For full information concerning "delegates" of the United States Christian Commission see Moss, pp. 541, 542.

[9] The whole number of delegates who served under the Christian Commission during the war was 4,119. About two-thirds of this number were laymen, a large number being physicians and nurses.

this new demand: "The organization of the *great* armies of the United States has created an increased necessity for an enlarged liberality and a much more zealous and combined effort in this good work." The report goes on to state that "the soldiers generally receive with eagerness the tracts offered them, especially the wounded and sick." The report closes by asking each preacher to take a collection during the year for the tract cause, and also to encourage the people to give more liberally.[10] The report is typical of many other reports to the various Conferences of the Methodist Church during the war, and an examination of the report of the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from 1862 to 1865, shows a considerable gain in gifts each successive year for tract distribution.

1862	$11,679 49
1863	12,534 46
1864	17,198 04
1865	22,322 40[11]

Most of the Conferences at their various sessions held during the war passed resolutions commending the Christian Commission. The following are those passed by the Newark Conference in 1864, which are typical of the others:

Resolved, That in the Christian Commission we recognize an organization eminently humane, patriotic, and Christian in its design; abundant and efficient in its labors in behalf of the souls as well as the bodies of our soldiers, in the field and in the hospital, and that we commend it to the confidence and liberality of all who love God and souls—all who love their country and have a regard for the noble men who face wounds and death for us.

Resolved, That the preachers on the several districts will keep one of their number in the service of the Chris-

[10] Minutes Cincinnati Conference, 1862, p. 12. Also Minutes New York East Conference, 1864, p. 38.

[11] General Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1862-1865.

tian Commission all the time that the exigencies of the army require, and that the other brethren of the district will supply his appointments during his absence; that the presiding elder of the district and two others whom the preachers of the district shall elect, shall be a committee to superintend the arrangements necessary in carrying out the foregoing proposition.[12]

In many instances the Conference indorsed the Sanitary Commission as well as the Christian Commission, and many of the Churches were active in co-operating with it also.[13]

THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

Unlike the Christian Commission, the American Bible Society did not originate with the war, but had already had a long and useful life before the war began, having been organized in 1816. Our interest in it here is to see how this society contributed to the welfare of the army and navy, and also to see how the Churches co-operated with it in this work.

The opportunity of supplying the troops with the Bible was early seized by the society, and its activities in connection with the army and navy began with the very opening of the war. In the summer of 1861, 400,000 copies of the Bible were delivered for distribution to the volunteer troops, and also twenty-four vessels of the blockading fleet were supplied.[14] To meet this increased demand occasioned by the war, the society had necessarily to increase its funds, and to do this more agents must be appointed to go among the Churches and solicit, and appeals for the society were at various times issued through the Church papers.

An examination of the statistics of the Methodist

[12] Minutes Newark Conference, 1864, p. 38. For similar resolutions see Minutes Troy Conference, 1865, p. 45; Pittsburgh Conference, 1865, p. 30; Cincinnati Conference, 1863, p. 33.

[13] Minutes Indiana Conference, 1864, p. 6; Newark Conference, 1864, pp. 37, 38.

[14] *Western Christian Advocate*, Oct. 23, 1861.

Church for the four years of the war show a considerable increase in the number of agents of the American Bible Society from that Church.

To show the magnitude of the work accomplished by the Bible Society in connection with the war I give a summary of the report for the year 1864. From April 1, 1863, until March 1, 1864, the receipts of the society amounted to $429,464.12, and during this year 994,473 volumes of the Bible alone were distributed, 5,000 Testaments were sent to Richmond for Union prisoners, 20,000 volumes were sent to the Confederate army under General J. E. Johnston, 50,000 volumes were sent to General Bragg's army in the Southwest, 100,000 volumes were sent to the Board of Colportage, of North Carolina, and besides these large grants the Christian Commission distributed over a half million volumes in the Union army and navy and the various hospitals.[15]

From the above report it will be seen that the Bible Society did not confine its work to the Union troops, but grants were made all through the war to the Southern armies, and also to local Southern Bible Societies. In 1863, 30,000 volumes were given to the Virginia Bible Society, and in August, 1863, 25,000 Testaments were granted to the Southern Baptist Sunday School Board for use in the South.[16]

The Bible Society and the United States Christian Commission worked together in the distribution of religious literature in the armies; indeed, the Bible Society depended upon the delegates of the Christian Commission and regular chaplains entirely for such work.

It is interesting to note the marked increase in the gifts of the Methodist Church in the United States to the American Bible Society during the course of the war, showing that the Churches were fully aroused to

[15] General Conference Journal, 1864, pp. 437-439. Also Minutes New England Conference, 1864, p. 30.

[16] Minutes Cincinnati Conference, 1863, pp. 26-29.

the best interests of the armies and navies. The gifts by years are as follows:

1862	$36,187
1863	55,685
1864	78,780
1865	101,743[17]

The Methodist Episcopal Church co-operated also with the American Temperance Union in sending temperance tracts to the soldiers and sailors. This work was carried on largely through the Sunday schools. In 1863 it was reported that "nearly 500 Sunday schools had sent from 1,000 to 10,000 tracts each."[18]

ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE AID OF FREEDMEN.

It will be profitable in this connection, in order to get the situation clearly before us, to review briefly the attitude of those in authority, during the war, toward the Negroes, and also the efforts on the part of military commanders and others to meet the vast problem presented by the Negro population in the Southern States. The contact of the Union armies with the slave population as they invaded the South naturally unsettled them, and from the outset of the war the military commanders had to deal with a Negro problem.

It was the policy of the Government at the beginning of the war to interfere as little as possible with slavery. After the Battle of Bull Run the most stringent orders were issued to the commanders not to harbor any slave property, and hundreds of escaping slaves who had come into the Union camps were given up to their owners.[19] General McClellan in his proclamation to the people of Western Virginia in May, 1861, states that all their rights will be respected, and that there will be no interference with their slaves; and in July of the same year

[17] General Minutes, 1862-1865.
[18] *Zion's Herald*, March 25, 1863.
[19] Autobiography of Oliver Otis Howard, vol. ii, pp. 165-167.

the commander at Washington issued a general order stating that "fleeing slaves will under no pretext whatever be permitted to reside or be in any way harbored in the quarters and camps of the troops serving in this department. Neither will such slaves be allowed to accompany troops on the march."[20] But this method of dealing with the slaves was not and could not be permanent, owing to the fact that in many cases such treatment of slaves would be inhuman, and also to the fact that the attitude of the authorities toward the slaves underwent a gradual change as the war progressed.

General B. F. Butler, in command at Fortress Monroe, adopted the clever expedient of classing the escaped slaves as "contraband of war," and put them to work upon the Union works. On July 30, 1861, he reports nine hundred such Negroes under his charge.[21] This plan was allowed to stand by the Secretary of War, though Butler is warned to allow no interference "with the servants of peaceable citizens," nor "is the voluntary return of any fugitive" to be prevented.[22] The proclamation of Fremont, in August, 1861, declaring free the slaves of those in rebellion in the district under his command,[23] was promptly recalled by the President.[24] This proclamation of Fremont's, and Butler's action in regard to the slaves, made these commanders exceedingly popular with the Church people. By act of Congress, approved March 13, 1862, a new article of war was created. It prohibited all persons in the military service from employing the forces under their command to return slaves to claiming owners, and provided trial by court martial and the penalty of dismissal for its viola-

[20] McPherson, pp. 144, 145.

[21] Moore's "Rebellion Record," vol. ii, part ii, pp. 437, 438; also Howard, vol. ii, pp. 168, 169.

[22] Moore, vol. ii, part ii, p. 493.

[23] *Ibid*, vol. iii, part ii, p. 33.

[24] McPherson, pp. 246, 247.

tion.[25] The friends of freedom hailed this act with no little satisfaction, and it indicates the change in the attitude of the Government toward the slaves.

The policy of employing Negroes, begun by Butler in the summer of 1861, was soon adopted by other military commanders. Grant in his Vicksburg campaign made use of Negro labor, and in order to care for the many thousands of refugees that came to him he set them to work under the direction of an army chaplain picking cotton on the abandoned plantations, for which they received a stipulated wage.[26] This was soon a common practice on the part of many commanders,[27] and Negroes were employed in the hospitals as nurses and cooks, as well as in rougher forms of labor.[28]

As the number of Negroes dependent upon the care and protection of the military commanders increased it became necessary to organize departments of Negro affairs. Such a department was organized by General Butler in December, 1863, in his department, which included Eastern Virginia and part of North Carolina. Among the duties of those placed in charge of this work was to take an accurate census of the colored inhabitants in his district, provide food, clothing, and medicines where needed, see that all the able-bodied had employment, and take charge of lands allotted to the use of the Negroes.[29] There was an effort, also, on the part of the military commanders to establish schools for the freedmen. In March, 1864, General Banks, in command at New Orleans, issued an order providing schools for freedmen in each school district, even ordering land to be bought and schoolhouses erected; and "books, stationery, and apparatus for the use of such schools" was to be provided, and also "a well-selected

[25] Howard, vol. ii, p. 172.
[26] Grant's "Memoirs," vol. i, pp. 124-126.
[27] "Official Records," Series I, vol. xxiv, p. 15.
[28] *Ibid,* Series III, vol. iv, p. 32.
[29] Moore's "Rebellion Record," vol. viii, part ii, pp. 261-264.

library'' was to be purchased for each ''freed person'' who was above school age, ''at a cost to each, including a case to contain the same, not exceeding $2.50.''[30]

This condition of affairs in relation to the freedmen in the South offered great opportunities for work to the Churches and benevolent organizations in the North, which they were not slow to improve.

The first religious organization to turn its attention to the needs of the freedmen was the American Missionary Association. General Butler and E. L. Pierce wrote to this society in 1861, pointing out the great need among the freedmen. The society promptly responded to this appeal, and before the end of 1861 had several representatives in the field.[31] By the beginning of 1862 new societies began to be formed in various sections of the North for the express purpose of aiding the freedmen.

Among these various societies were the following:

1. The National Freedmen's Relief Association, formed in New York, February 22, 1862.
2. Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Association, organized 1862.
3. The Contraband Relief Association of Cincinnati.
4. The Freedmen's Relief Association of the District of Columbia.
5. Woman's Relief Association of Philadelphia.
6. The Northwestern Freedmen's Aid Commission.
7. The Contraband Relief Society of St. Louis.
8. The Nashville Refugee Aid Society.
9. The Western Freedmen's Aid Society.
10. The Washington Freedmen's Aid Society.
11. The Arkansas Relief Committee of Little Rock.
12. The New Haven Freedmen's Aid Society.
13. The Worchester Freedmen's Aid Society.
14. The Trenton Freedmen's Aid Society.

[30] ''Official Reords,'' Series III, vol. iv, pp. 193-194.
[31] Freedmen's Bureau, Paul R. Peirce, pp. 26, 27.

15. Maine Freedmen's Relief Society.[32]

The Methodist Episcopal Church early in the war showed considerable interest in the condition of the Freedmen. At a meeting of the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held early in 1862, action was taken to establish a mission for colored people at Port Royal and vicinity.[33] This interest also manifested itself from the beginning of the war by frequent editorials, articles, and appeals for the freedmen which appeared in the Church periodicals from time to time.

The Church as a whole manifested considerable impatience with the administration in the early years of the war for what it considered its dallying attitude toward emancipation. Again and again immediate emancipation was urged in pulpit and press. General Fremont seemed to be the Churches' especial hero and favorite, and when he issued his proclamation emancipating the slaves of all those in rebellion within his military district, he was hailed with acclaim by the Methodist press, and when Mr. Lincoln commanded him to withdraw the order, Fremont was hailed as too wise for his generation.

The Freedmen's organizations which seemed to have the largest share of Methodist co-operation were the National Freedmen's Relief Association, in the East, and the Western Freedmen's Aid Commission, in the West;[34] the former with headquarters in New York, and

[32] Peirce, pp. 27, 28. Also Minutes Maine Conference, 1865; Cincinnati Conference Minutes, 1864, pp. 22, 23.

[33] *Christian Advocate,* 1862, Feb. 27.

[34] The first public meeting of the Western Freedmen's Commission was held in Morris Chapel (Methodist), Cincinnati, Nov. 19, 1863. Representatives of almost every Christian denomination were present. Rev. Adam Poe (Methodist) was president, and Rev. Chas. Kingsley, editor of the *Western Christian Advocate,* delivered one of the addresses. The treasurer reported receipts for eleven months amounting to $9,437.75, besides thousands of garments, books, shoes, blankets, etc.—*Western Christian Advocate,* Nov. 25. 1863.

the latter in Cincinnati; and in the Northwest, the Northwestern Freedmen's Aid Commission. The method of this co-operation was in throwing open the churches for the taking of collections for this work, and the sending of teachers and missionaries into the field. Most of the Conferences during the last two years of the war appointed special committees on the freedmen's work, whose reports generally contained the indorsement of some freedmen's organization.

The report of such a committee for the New York East Conference in 1865 contains first an expression of confidence in the National Freedmen's Relief Association; second, a resolve asking that the members of the Conference take a deep interest in the objects of this association; and third, a resolve which proves the statement made above regarding the radical and sentimental position of the Church in reference to the Negro, which states, "That we recognize in the freedmen a vast body of native-born citizens entitled to all the privileges, immunities, and responsibilities of citizenship, including equally, with all other Union citizens, the protection of law and the right of suffrage, and that we will not slacken our efforts in their behalf until these rights are enjoyed by them."[35]

The report of a similar committee from the Cincinnati Conference[36] states that, while they heartily approve of the work of the various organizations for the relief of freedmen, yet they feel a special interest in the Western Freedmen's Aid Commission, as operating within their bounds, to which they promise sympathy and support; and they also recommend the appointment of J. M. Walden as corresponding secretary of the Western Freedmen's Commission.[37] The report of such a committee from the Indiana Conference stated "that it is

[35] New York East Conference Minutes, 1865, pp. 41, 42.
[36] Minutes Cincinnati Conference, 1864, pp. 22, 23.
[37] The secretary of this committee was Rev. J. M. Sullivan, an uncle of the writer and an ex-chaplain.

our duty to welcome in our midst the regular constituted agents of the Freedmen's Aid Commission and assist them in encouraging all our people to contribute money and clothing to relieve the sufferings of Negro contrabands."[38]

The General Conference of 1864, representing the whole Church, also appointed a committee on the freedmen, which reported "that in the events which have thrown the thousands of freed people upon the benevolence of the humane people of the North, we recognize a Providential call to the Christian public . . . and especially to the Church of Christ for the means of their evangelization." The second resolve indorses the Boston Educational Association, the Western Freedmen's Aid Commission, the National Freedmen's Relief Association, the Northwestern Freedmen's Relief Association, the Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Association, and the Western Sanitary Commission, and commends them to the liberality of Methodist people everywhere. The last one states "that the best interests of the freedmen and of the country demand legislation that shall foster and protect this people," and they urge upon Congress to establish a bureau of freedmen's affairs.[39]

A bill establishing a Freedmen's Bureau as a part of the War Department was passed by Congress March 3, 1865, which was to continue during the war and one year thereafter, but Congress afterwards by legislative act extended the life of the bureau.[40] The object of the bureau was to supervise, aid, and protect the freedmen in the South, and at its head was placed General O. O. Howard, a man who had the confidence of the Church and Christian people generally. This bureau continued its operations until January 1, 1869, and dur-

[38] Minutes Indiana Conference, 1864, p. 32.

[39] General Conference Journal, 1864, p. 130.

[40] House Executive Documents, 39th Congress, 1st Session, vol. ii, p. 41, No. 11; also Howard, vol. ii, pp. 201, 202.

ing this period the various Churches in the North established on a firm basis their work among the freedmen.

Toward the close of the war, or soon after, many of the denominations organized their own denominational societies to carry on this work. The United Presbyterians of Ohio organized their own Freedmen's Society in 1863, and in the same year the Reformed Presbyterians, the United Brethren, and one branch of the Baptists also organized denominational societies for work among freedmen. In 1865 the Congregationalists organized a similar society and called upon the Church to give a quarter million annually for this work. The Protestant Episcopal Church in October, 1865, at their convention in Philadelphia, organized a Freedmen's Aid Society, and the Baptists the same year appealed to their Churches for $100,000 to begin their work.[41] The Methodist Episcopal Church continued to work through the various general organizations until after the close of the war.

During the last years of the war a number of missionaries to Negroes in the South were sent out by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Churches, Sunday schools, and lay schools were established at various places. At Newbern, N. C., a day school was conducted in the Colored Methodist Church, and three Sunday schools were conducted in that place and vicinity.[42] Besides these missionaries to the Negroes a number of Methodist ministers acted as agents of several of these freedmen's organizations, the Rev. J. M. Walden, of the Cincinnati Conference, who was corresponding secretary of the Western Freedmen's Aid Commission, being the most prominent. He afterwards became secretary of the

[41] "Christian Educators in Council," 1883; compiled by J. C. Hartzell.

[42] *Christian Advocate,* Jan. 21, 1864.

Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and later a bishop.[43]

At the close of the war, in 1866, the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in Cincinnati by a convention of ministers and laymen called for that purpose. Later this society was given official recognition and indorsed by the General Conference of 1868, and has remained one of the principal benevolent organizations of the Church to the present time.

[43] Among the other Methodist ministers who held similar positions during the war were Rev. Uriah Eberhart, Upper Iowa Conference, and Rev. C. P. Pillsbury, Wisconsin Conference, agents of the Northwestern Freedmen's Aid Commission; Revs. J. R. Stillman, Cincinnati Conference; J. R. Luke, Illinois Conference, and J. F. Jaques, Illinois Conference, agents Western Freedmen's Commission. Revs. H. S. White, Providence Conference; William Livesey, Providence Conference; A. C. Rose, Troy Conference; S. Q. Gibson, Ohio Conference; A. D. Martin, Erie Conference; and C. C. Cone, Maine Conference, were agents of other such societies or commissions. This data has been obtained from the General Minutes, 1861-1865.

CHAPTER X.

Bibliography.

I. Slavery Struggle in the Church.

1. Primary Sources.

CHURCH DOCUMENTS.

The General Conference Journals, especially those from 1844 to 1864, inclusive. The General Conference is the law-making body of the Church (Methodist Episcopal) and meets every four years. The Journal contains the minutes of the proceedings and the reports of committees.

The Disciplines of the Methodist Episcopal Church from 1784 to 1864, inclusive. The Discipline contains the Constitution and Rules of the Church, and is revised every four years in conformity with the action of the General Conference.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences. Each of the several Annual Conferences published Minutes, in which may be found material bearing on the slavery contest, such as formal resolutions, reports of committees, and records of discussions.

Methodist Church Property Case, New York, 1851. This case relates to the division of the property of the Methodist Book Concern, brought by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. This volume contains copies of the various documents relating to the division of the Church. Reported by R. Sutton, special and Congressional reporter.

Report of Debates in the General Conference of 1844, by Robert Athow West, official reporter, New York, 1844.

These debates relate to the division of the Church over slavery, which took place at this General Conference.

CHURCH PERIODICALS.

The three most important Methodist journals for the whole of the slavery contest within the Church are: *Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal,* published in Boston; the *Christian Advocate and Journal,* published in New York, which was the chief official publication of the Church; and the *Western Christian Advocate,* published in Cincinnati. The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* and the *Central Christian Advocate,* published in Chicago and St. Louis, are valuable for the years 1850 to 1860.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS.

The material among Government documents bearing on the slavery contest in the Churches is very meager. *Congressional Globe,* vol. xxi, part i, p. 453; House Report of Committees, 1st and 2d Sessions, 34th Congress, vol. ii, 1855-56, being about the extent of such material.

2. Secondary Sources.

The most important book for the slavery contest in the Methodist Episcopal Church is the "History of the Great Secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Year 1845," by Rev. Charles Elliott, D. D., Cincinnati, 1855. This is the official history of the division of the Church, from the Northern standpoint, authorized by the General Conference of 1848. It contains a great mass of valuable material with copious quotations from periodicals, pamphlets, etc. Documents to the number of seventy-seven are appended.

"The Anti-Slavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church," by L. C. Matlack, 1881. The best brief summary of the entire slavery struggle, written by an active participant in the struggle, having

been one of the founders of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, the anti-slavery Church. The book would be much more satisfactory, however, if it contained full footnotes.

"History of Methodism in the United States," by J. M. Buckley, 1896. The best of the briefer histories of Methodism in the United States.

Brief accounts and discussions on Slavery and the Church, all written from an extreme partisan standpoint: "The Methodist Episcopal Church and Slavery," by Daniel De Vinné; "Border Methodism and Border Slavery," by Rev. J. Maryland McCarter, 1858; "Slavery in the Methodist Episcopal Church," by Elias Bowen, 1859; "Vindication of Border Methodism," by Samuel Huffman, 1859; "Methodism and Slavery," by L. C. Matlack, 1848; a collection of pamphlets bearing on Slavery, compiled by Rev. Richard Watson, a member of the Executive Committee of the British Anti-Slavery Society, bound in eleven volumes. Deposited in the Methodist Book Concern, Cincinnati: "Cleavage Between Eastern and Western Virginia," by C. H. Ambler, in *American Historical Review,* July, 1910. In this article the importance of the Church in the disruption of Virginia is discussed, using the Methodist Episcopal Church as the typical example. "The Fight for the Northwest, 1860," by W. E. Dodd, *American Historical Review,* July, 1911. In the course of this article the political influence of the Churches in the election of 1860 in the Northwest is discussed, with special emphasis upon the Methodist Church.

BIOGRAPHIES.

These consist mostly of lives of Bishops and prominent ministers, written in highly eulogistic style. "Peter Cartwright's Autobiography," 1856. Peter Cartwright was one of the best-known pioneer preachers of the Middle West and took strong anti-slavery ground. "Life of

Orange Scott,'' by L. C. Matlack, 1848. One of the early abolition leaders in the Methodist Church. ''Life of Adam Crooks,'' by Mrs. E. W. Crooks, 1875; ''Life of John P. Durbin, D. D.,'' by John A. Roche, 1889. Dr. Durbin was secretary of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church during the bitterest part of the slavery controversy.

GENERAL ACCOUNTS.

''Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America,'' by Henry Wilson, 3 vols., 1877. Uncritical and without footnotes, and of little importance for the slavery contest in the Churches, but the most complete survey of the whole question of American slavery.

''History of the United States, 1850-1877,'' by James Ford Rhodes, 7 vols. Volume I refers briefly to the Churches in relation to the slavery struggle, pp. 128, 129, 145, 146.

''Slavery and Abolition,'' by A. B. Hart, Vol. XVI, American Nation Series, gives brief summary of slavery in its relation to the Churches. The most valuable part of this volume for this study is the chapter devoted to a bibliography on the general subject of Slavery and Abolition.

II. Relation of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the War.

1. Primary Sources.

CHURCH DOCUMENTS.

General Conference Journals for 1860 and 1864. Contain proceedings without debates, with reports of committees in the Appendix. A valuable source.

The General Minutes of the Annual Conferences in the United States, 1861-1865, 3 vols. This is little more than a bare collection of statistics of the Churches. In

these volumes are also printed brief memoirs of deceased preachers.

Individual Conference Minutes. Each Annual Conference published Minutes, which contain besides the bare statistical reports, reports of committees and resolutions on various subjects relating to the war.

CHURCH PERIODICALS.

The *Christian Advocate and Journal,* published in New York, Edward Thomson, D. D., editor, 1860-1864. Generally recognized as the principal weekly journal of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Well conducted and an excellent source. *Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal,* published in Boston and edited by Rev. Erastus O. Haven. This was the oldest Methodist journal and had a reputation for independence. *Western Christian Advocate,* published in Cincinnati and edited by Charles Kingsley, D. D. Next to the New York paper the most influential of the Methodist journals. *The Methodist,* an independent journal, published in New York and ably edited by Geo. R. Crooks, D. D., and John McClintock, D.D., two of the best-known and ablest ministers of the Church.

Other Methodist journals which contain valuable material relating to the war are: The *Central Christian Advocate,* published in St. Louis and edited during the war by Charles Elliott, D. D.; *Northwestern Christian Advocate,* of Chicago, edited by T. M. Eddy, D. D.; also the *Buffalo* and *Pittsburgh Christian Advocates;* the *Pacific Christian Advocate,* of Portland, Ore.; the *Ladies' Repository* and *Der Christliche Apologete,* both published in Cincinnati; the *Quarterly Review,* of New York, and a number of other local and smaller periodicals.

Occasional references bearing on the relation of the Church to the Civil War are also found in *Harper's Weekly* and other secular journals.

MANUSCRIPTS.

Considerable manuscript material bearing on this study is available. Among such material are the Minutes of the weekly preachers' meetings of the various cities, such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cincinnati. These manuscript Minutes may be found in the various historical collections of the Methodist Church in the cities above referred to. These Minutes contain considerable material of local importance.

Some private documents and papers are of importance, such as the letters and papers of Bishop Simpson, now in the possession of his daughter, Mrs. Chas. W. Bony, 906 Pine Street, Philadelphia; also the manuscript journal of Rev. Daniel Stevenson, one of the eighteen ministers of the Kentucky Conference, Methodist Church South, who came into the Methodist Episcopal Church at the close of the war; the journal now in the possession of Prof. R. T. Stevenson, Delaware, Ohio. Other collections of letters and papers may be found in the Methodist Historical Rooms, 1018 Arch Street, Philadelphia; 150 Fifth Avenue, New York; and 36 Boomfield Street, Boston.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS.

Material relating to the war activities of the Church in Government documents is not abundant. The most numerous references are found in the "Official Records" of the Union and Confederate Armies, 128 vols., with General Index, especially in Series II, which relates to Prisoners of War. The disloyal activities of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, during the war are set forth in the Report of House and Senate Committees on war claims, found in House Reports of Committees, 43d Congress, 1st Session, Document 777, and in Senate Report of Committees, 45th Congress, 2d Session, No. 146.

"Richardson's "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," in ten volumes, published as House Miscellaneous Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, No. 210, Vol. VI, contains President Lincoln's messages and papers.

MISCELLANEOUS COLLECTIONS OF DOCUMENTS.

"McPherson's History of the Rebellion," by Edward McPherson, one time clerk in the House of Representatives. A very valuable compilation, made up mostly of quotations from official documents and newspapers. In the Appendix is a chapter devoted to the Church and the Rebellion, which has been an invaluable source for this study. "Appleton's Annual Cyclopædia" for 1860-1865. A very valuable source based on newspaper reports. "The Rebellion Record—A Diary of American Events," edited by Frank Moore. "Abraham Lincoln, A History," by Nicolay and Hay, Vol. VI, contains a chapter on Lincoln and the Churches, which has considerable value for this study.

The Methodist Almanac, 1860-1865, for some general statistics relating to the Church not elsewhere found. "Annals of the United States Christian Commission," by Rev. Samuel Moss, home secretary of the commission. A complete history of the commission, told year by year, with statistics, copies of letters, and other documents relating to the work of the commission. "Incidents of the United States Christian Commission," by Edward P. Smith. A collection of incidents relating to the activities of the commission, poorly organized, and with no classification whatever.

2. Secondary Sources.

GENERAL.

"The Church and the Rebellion," by R. L. Stanton, D. D. An attempt to show that the war was brought on largely because of the influences of the Churches, and

controversial in character. "An Appeal to the Records," by E. Q. Fuller, D. D., 1876. An argument supporting the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church in going into the South. "The Freedmen's Bureau," by Paul K. Pierce, 1904. University of Iowa Studies.

LOCAL HISTORIES.

"History of Methodism in Wisconsin," by Rev. P. S. Bennett and Rev. James Lawson, 1890. "Southwestern Methodism," by Rev. Charles Elliott, D. D., 1868. Made up largely of extracts from the *Central Christian Advocate* for the four years of the war, of which Dr. Elliott was the war editor. "Indiana Methodism," by F. G. Holliday, 1873. "History of the New England Conference," by James Mudge, 1910. "History of the New England Southern Conference," and numerous other local histories of like nature.

HISTORY OF INDIVIDUAL CHURCHES.

"History of Ebenezer Church, of Southwark, Philadelphia;" "Memorial Record of Wharton Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia," by J. C. Hunterson. "Seventy-seventh Anniversary of the Union Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia." In this church the famous General Conference of 1864 was held.

BIOGRAPHY.

There are a number of biographies of bishops and prominent ministers which contain material for this study. "Life of Bishop Matthew Simpson," by George R. Crooks, D. D., 1890. A carefully written biography, giving a detailed account of the bishop's war activities. "Life of Bishop Janes," by Henry B. Ridgeway, D. D., 1882. "Life of Rev. Thomas A. Morris," by Rev. John F. Marlay, 1875. "Life Story of Rev. Davis W. Clark," by Daniel Curry, 1874. All of the above were bishops during all or a part of the Civil War. "Autobiography

of Granville Moody," edited by Rev. S. Weeks, 1889. "Life and Letters of Rev. Dr. McClintock," by George R. Crooks, 1876. "Life of Chaplain McCabe," by Frank Milton Bristol, 1908. "Life of George H. Stewart," written by himself, edited by Robert Ellis Thompson, 1890. Mt. Stewart was one of the founders and president of the United States Christian Commission.

3. Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

GENERAL.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 2 vols. (1858-1865), 1870. Merely a collection of statistics. "History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," by Gross Alexander. Volume XI of the American Church History Series. The best brief history of that denomination. "History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," 1845. Contains collection relating to the organization of the Church South. "The Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church," 1844-1846, by E. H. Myers. "History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," by A. H. Redford, 1871. "Annals of Southern Methodism," by C. F. Deems. "History of Methodism," by Bishop H. N. McTyeire, 1884.

LOCAL HISTORIES.

"History of Methodism in Kentucky," A. H. Redford, 3 vols., 1868. "A Critical View of the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, during the Great Rebellion," J. H. Main, 1868. "Methodism in Missouri," Vols. I and II, by D. R. McAnally, editor of the *St. Louis Christian Advocate* (Methodist Church South) during the war; Vol. III, by W. H. Lewis, 1890. "History of Methodism in Georgia and Florida, 1785-1865," George G. Smith, Jr., 1877. "Sketches of the Virginia Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church,

South," by J. H. Lafferty. "Martyrdom in Missouri," by Rev. W. M. Leftwich, 2 vols., 1870. An account of the persecution of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Missouri during and following the war. "The Methodist Church Case of Maysville, Ky.," by Henry Ward, F. T. Hard, and R. H. Stanton.

BIOGRAPHIES.

A number of biographies of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have been written, some of which contain material for this study. "Life of Bishop James Osgood Andrew," by G. G. Smith, 1882. This biography bears particularly upon the division of the Church. "Life of Bishop Henry Biddleman Bascom," by M. M. Henkle, 1854. "Life of Bishop William Capers," by Wm. M. Wightman, 1858. "Life of John Berry McFerrin," by Bishop O. P. Fitzgerald, 1888. "Bishop George Foster Pierce," by Geo. G. Smith, 1888. Bishop Pierce was particularly active in his labors for the Confederacy. "Life of Bishop Enoch Mather Marvin," by T. M. Finney.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

Chaplains By Conferences.

BALTIMORE CONFERENCE.

Bull, J. W.
Hoover, J. W.

BLACK RIVER CONFERENCE.

Axtell, N. G.
Chase, W. D.
Ferguson, J. V.
Jones, E. W.
Mitchell, John.
Nicols, W. A.
Pierce, M. R.
Palmer, L. L.

CENTRAL GERMAN CONFERENCE.

Schmidt, H. D. (1864)

CENTRAL ILLINOIS CONFERENCE.

Brown, G. W.
Cotton, Thos.
Gue, G. W.
Haney, R.
Haney, M. L.
Higgins, A. C.
Hackard, M. D.
Millsops, J. S.
Palmer, Geo. R.
Peterson, W. S.
Ransom, E.
Tullis, Amos K.
Underwood, W.

CENTRAL OHIO CONFERENCE.

Alderman, J. W.
Collier, Geo. W.
Cozier, B. F. W.
Ferris, C. G.
Hallington, A.
Ketcham, C. W.
Kennedy, Oliver.
Morrow, J. M.
Poucher, J.
Poe, A. B.
Reynolds, Chas.
Strong, D. G.
Wilson, Amos.

CINCINNATI CONFERENCE.

Bitler, M.
Beall, A. U.
Brewster, D. A.
Blackburn, Jas.
Callender, N.
Cramer, M. J.
Chalfant, J. F.
Gaddis, M. P.
Hill, J. J.
Moody, J.
Miller, L. P.
Middleton, J. H.
Sears, C. W.
Spence, J. F.
Stillwell, J. R.
Schmidt, H. D. (1863)
Shinn, John.
Wright, J. F.
Weakley, J. W.
Yourtee, S. L.
Sullivan, J. M.

DES MOINES CONFERENCE.

Jones, C. J.
Slusser, F. M.

DETROIT CONFERENCE.

Blanchard, J.
Benson, W.
Edwards, A.
Jacokes, D. C.
May, R. W.
Mahan, Wm.
May, W. C.
Sneart, J. S.
Shaw, A. C.
Tracey, D. B.
Taylor, G.

EAST BALTIMORE CONFERENCE.

Brittain, A.
Couser, S. L. M.
Crever, B. H.
Coleman, J. A.
Earnshaw, Wm.
Ferguson, W. G.
Gere, J. A.
Hartman, G.
Houck, W. A.
Keith, W. H.
McClure, T. F.
Miller, J. R.
Ross, J. A.
Reese, A. A.
Stevens, W. H.
Vinton, R. S.
Wilson, J. T.

EAST GENESEE CONFERENCE.

Buck, D. D.
Brown, J. N.
Drake, R. A.
Dickinson, S. B.
Haskell, W. M.
Watts, J.

EAST MAINE CONFERENCE.

Brown, J. L.
Bray, H. L.
Chase, B. A.
Chase, S. F.
Church, A. J.
Ellis, C. H.
Higgins, Phineas.
Stout, S. F.
Tefft, B. F.

ERIE CONFERENCE.

Bear, R. M.
Breen, J. M.
Hulburt, R. H.
Hawk, G. B.
Lytle, J. S.
Ludwick, E. A.
Moore, H. H.
Morton, A. D.
Steve, D. M.
Williams, L. D.

GENESEE CONFERENCE.

Bowman, J.
Buck, E. M.
Bills, J. E.
Dolematyr, G.
Foot, L. T.
Kendall, A.
McNeal, Benj. F.
Robie, J. E.
Rogers, W. H.
Steele, Allan.

HOLSTON CONFERENCE.

Milburn, Wm.

ILLINOIS CONFERENCE.

Berger, J. S.
Baldwin, C. P.
Barwick, J. S.
Bradshaw, C. G.
Crant, J. L.
Evans, W. M.
Guthrie, R. E.
Hammond, P. D.
Hungerford, B.

Jones, L.
Jacquess, F. J.
Kirkpabuck, J. L.
Locke, J. R.
Miller, I. T.
Newinan, W. J.
Palmer, J. A.
Rutledge, W. J.
Sargent, J. C.
Vandewater, A. C.
Wood, P.
Wilkins, E. D.

INDIANA CONFERENCE.

Brown, S.
Carson, L. E.
Campbell, M. M.
Chapman, H. O.
Daniel, W. V.
Gilmore, Hiram.
Gaskins, E.
Hibben, H. B.
Hewing, F. A.
Hobbs, M. M. C.
Hight, J. J.
Hancock, L. M.
Hucherson, F. A.
Haimeton, J. B.
Kiger, John.
McNoughten, S. W.
Pierce, R. R.
Patterson, N. M.
St. Clair, J. F.
Whitled, Thomas A.
Woods, Milas.

IOWA CONFERENCE.

Allender, R. B.
Audas, Thos.
Burgess, John.
Evans, F. W.
Ebod, John.
Garrison, S. F. C.
Hare, W. H.
Hestwood, S.
Ingalls, P. P.
Kirkpatrick, A. J.
Latham, J. W.
Murphy, Dennis.
Poston, W.
Stewart, I. I.
Simmons, J. T.
Teter, J. P.
White, J. H.

KANSAS CONFERENCE.

Brooks, S.
Cline, J. S.
Duvall, R. P.
Davis, W. R.
Fisher, H. D.
Fevrill, T. J.
Gardner, O. B.
Kline, J. S.
Leard, J. H.
Paulson, John.
Robb, W.

KENTUCKY CONFERENCE.

Black, W. H.
Burket, M. H. B.
Lathrop, E.
Pell, J. P.

MAINE CONFERENCE.

Colby, Jos.
French, L. P.
Fuller, S. A.
Godfrey, A. C.

MICHIGAN CONFERENCE.

Brockway, W. H.
Cogshall, I.
Earl, L. W.
Elrod, A. J.
Glass, F.
Jones, J.
Patterson, H. A.
Smith, M. J.

MINNESOTA CONFERENCE.

Brown, L. D.
Bowdish, C. H.
Balles, S.
Crary, B. F.
Cobb, D.
Light, O. P.
Lathrop, E. R.
Peet, J.
Richardson, G. W.
Tucker, Ezra.

MISSOURI AND ARKANSAS CONFERENCE.

Brooks, Jos.
Bratton, T. B.
Cox, J. H.
Hopkins, J. H.
Linen, J.
McDonald, A. C.
McNeiley, L. T.
Oyler, James.
Pile, W. A.
Pace, L. C.
Shumate, N.
Sellers, Wm.
Williams, T. J.

NEBRASKA CONFERENCE.

Spillman, W. P.

NEWARK CONFERENCE.

Brown, J. H.
Crane, E. P.
Daily, J. P.
Faull, John.
Gray, S. L.
Horton, G. W.
Lenhart, J. L.
Moore, S. T.
Pritchard, B. F.
Simpson, B. F.
Wolfe, F. L.
Yard, R. B.

NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE.

Bent, G. R.
Cushman, I. S.
Cromack, J. C.
Gage, Rodney.
Hemstead, H. E.
Haven, Gilbert.
Lacount, W. F.
Leanard, W. G.
Morse, F. C.
Winslow, E. D.
Macreading, C. S.

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONFERENCE.

Adams, J. W.
Barnes, G. S.
Buckley, J. M.
Emerson, J. C.
Lergo, E. H.
Manly, R. M.
Pike, James.
Stratton, R. K.
Thomas, W. H.
Wilkins, L.

NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE.

Abbott, W. T.
Given, R.
Graw, J. B.
Heisley, C. W.
Hartraufft, C. R.
Hill, C. E.
James, J. H.
Rose, F. B.
Sovereign, T.
Stockton, W. C.
White, J.

NEW YORK CONFERENCE.

Champion, J. H.
Ferris, D. O.
Gale, S. G.
Keyes, E. R.
Parker, John.

Strickland, W. P.
Shelling, C.
Wheatley, Richard.

NEW YORK EAST CONFERENCE.

Gilden, W. H.
Inskip, J. S.

NORTH INDIANA CONFERENCE.

Beeks, G. C.
Barnett, Thos.
Barnhart, A. C.
Boyden, O. P.
Dale, L.
Eddy, A.
Hoback, W. K.
Lemon, O. V.
Layton, S.
McCarty, J. S.
Stout, S. T.
Smith, J. W.
Sparks, R. H.

NORTH OHIO CONFERENCE.

Bush, E. H.
Beatty, Samuel M.
Bushong, J. W.
Jones, A. P.
Matlack, J.
Nicherson, W. H.
Parish, H. L.
Phillips, Geo. S.
Pepper, G. W.
Warner, Lorengo.
Wheeler, Alfred.
Warner, L.

NORTH WEST INDIANA CONFERENCE.

Brakeman, N. L.
Claypool, J. H.
Donaldson, J. S.
Guion, G.
Huffman, H. D.
Hill, J.
Harker, W. S.
Reed, J. C.
Stafford, G. W.
Tarr, C. W.
Webb, T. E.

NORTHWEST WISCONSIN CONFERENCE.

Golden, T. C.
Johnson, J. W.
McKinley, Wm.
Springer, J. E.

OHIO CONFERENCE.

Byers, A. G.
Bennett, R. B.
Bethauser, Charles.
Berkstresser, H.
Drake, L. F.
Dillon, John.
Fry, B. St. James.
Gregg, J. C.
Griffith, W. H.
Holliday, W. C.
Hall, E. P.
Isaminger, G. W.
King, M. L.
Lewis, J. W.
Morris, Jos.
McCabe, C. C.
McIntire, Thos.

ONEIDA CONFERENCE.

Bristol, D. W.
Bowdish, A. C.
Cleveland, M. B.
Crippen, J. T.
Richardson, H. S.
Talbott, H. V.

PHILADELPHIA CONFERENCE.

Burkalow, J. T.
Crouch, C. J.

Fries, W. H.
Gregg, W. B.
Gracey, S. L.
Gregg, J. C.
Gray, J. R. T.
Hammond, W.
Kirkpatrick, Thos.
Lame, J. S.
Meredith, J. F.
O'Neill, W.
Poulson, T. L.
Rokestraw, G. G.
Smith, V.
Thomas, T. S.
Tull, W. T.
Way, E. J.
Welch, Jos.
Walton, W. B.

PITTSBURGH CONFERENCE.

Bradley, E. W.
Boyle, T. N.
Brady, E. W.
Castle, A. B.
Guvie, L. M.
High, J. C.
Keagle, J. S.
Locke, W. H.
Lane, A. J.
Leinmod, J. S.
McCleary, Thos.
Pierce, J. N.
Petty, A. L.
Thomas, J. M.
Vertican, F. W.
Vail, J. D.
Worthington, N. C.
Williams, A. G.

PROVIDENCE CONFERENCE.

Adams, C. C.
Cummings, S. S.
Gould, J. B.
Palmer, A.
White, H. S.

ROCK RIVER CONFERENCE.

Atchison, W. D.
Clendenning, J. M.
Cartwright, B. H.
Crews, H.
Flowers, J. W.
Haggerty, T. H.
Johnson, Philo.
Lyon, G. G.
Stuff, G. L. S.
Stoughton, J. C.
Satterfield, T. R.
Smith, W. H.
Teed, D.

SOUTH EAST INDIANA CONFERENCE.

Adams S. R.
Brouse, J. A.
Cotton, Jas.
Crawford, J. M.
Gatch, B. F.
Hurlburt, L.
Lozier, J. H.
Saunders, W. T.
Snyder, W. W.

SOUTH ILLINOIS CONFERENCE.

Bruner, W. B.
Clifford, Z. S.
Compton, G. W.
Cliffe, W.
Chipman, H. O.
Davis, J. P.
Eldridge, W. V.
Gillham, J. D.
Houts, T. F.
Lane, J. W.
Lockwood, J. H.
Massey, R. H.
Miner, R. H.

Morrison, A. B.
Ransom, A.
Woodard, J. B.
Walker, L. S.

TROY CONFERENCE.

Barber, L.
Bowdrye, L. N.
Clemens, S. W.
Eaton, J. W.
Farr, A. A.
Hager, C. L.
Marshall, L.
Mevill, S. M.
Robinson, R. H.
White, M.

UPPER IOWA CONFERENCE.

Eberhardt, U.
Kendig, A. B.
Trusdell, C. G.
Vincent, F. W.
Webb, John.

VERMONT CONFERENCE.

Dickinson, L. C.
Dayton, D. W.
Mack, D. A.
Roberts, J. L.
Simons, V. M.
Webster, A.
Webster, Harvey.

WEST IOWA CONFERENCE.

Goodfellow, T. N.
Smith, D. N.

WEST WISCONSIN CONFERENCE.

Brunson, Alfred.
Hammond, B. C.
Langley, Robert.
Walter, A. H.
Weirick, C. E.

WEST VIRGINIA CONFERENCE.

Battelle, G.
Drummond, J.
Gregg, A. W.
Hower, R. W.
Irwin, J. L.
Lydia, A. J.
Lyon, A. J.
Martin, Gildeon.
Monroe, T. H.
Reger, J. W.
Steele, Samuel.
Trainer, T. H.
Wallace, R. M.

WISCONSIN CONFERENCE.

Fallows, Samuel.
Jones, D. O.
Pillsbury, C. D.
Walker, J. M.
Walter, A. H.

WYOMING CONFERENCE.

Gavitt, W. H.
Roberts, E. F.
Schoomaker, A. H.
Weiss, S. W.
Wyatt, W.
Wheeler, Henry.

Appendix.

Union Chaplains From Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Missouri Conference.

Powell, A. H.
Senby, W.

Kentucky Conference.

Boyles, S. J.
Axline, D. W.
Johnston, J. J.
Eads, John R.
Buckner, E. P., surgeon in United States Army.
Parker, L. D.

Louisville Conference.

Lesley, M. N.
Bristow, J. H.
Burge, H. T.
Gardner, Robt. G.

APPENDIX B.

Methodist Ministers Who Were Delegates of the United States Christian Commission.

NAME.	1862.	CONFERENCE.
Alday, J. H.		Philadelphia.
Best, Wesley C.		Philadelphia.
Bodine, Henry H.		Philadelphia.
Boyle, W. E.		New Jersey.
Crouch, C. J.		Philadelphia.
Dobbins, Jas. B.		New Jersey.
Gilroy, Henry E.		Philadelphia.
Grocy, S. L.		Philadelphia.
King, Isaiah D.		New Jersey.
McCullough, J. B.		Philadelphia.
Owen, Roger		Philadelphia.
Patterson, D. L.		Philadelphia.
Robinson, W. C.		Philadelphia.
Ruth, Jno.		Philadelphia.
Smith, Wm. C.		New York.
Steele, David		Genesee.
Thomas, S. W.		Philadelphia.
Westwood, H. C.		Baltimore, Md.
Wood, W. B.		Philadelphia.

	1863.	
Abbott, J. T.		New England.
Adair, J. M.		Ohio.
Atkinson, H. K.		Maine.
Baird, J. N.		Pittsburgh.
Beck, F. H.		Black River.
Bent, G. R.		New England.
Bidwell, I. G.		Troy.
Brown, Azra		Cincinnati.
Brown, Jno. W.		East Baltimore.
Brown, J. H.		East Baltimore.
Castle, J. H.		Philadelphia.

NAME.	CONFERENCE.
Chalker, R. A.	New Jersey.
Cooper, G. W.	East Baltimore.
Crawford, Jas. M.	New York East.
Crouch, C. J.	Philadelphia.
Cummings, Silas S.	Providence.
Cushing, S. A.	New England.
Doyan, J. F.	Black River.
De Forrest, J. A.	New Hampshire.
Eddy, T. M.	Rock River.
Erwin, Jas.	Black River.
Faulks, Jas. B.	Newark.
Fluit, R.	Black River.
Freeman, J. M.	Newark.
Gilbert, G. S.	New York East.
Graves, A. S.	Oneida.
Gregg, Wm. B.	Philadelphia.
Hambleton, W. J.	New England.
Hance, Edmund	New Jersey.
Hawes, Edward	Indiana.
Heysinger, J. L.	Philadelphia.
High, W. C.	New England.
Holman, C.	New Hampshire.
Hwin, Henry F.	Philadelphia.
Jackson, S.	New England.
Janes, E. S. (Bishop)	
Kramer, Jno. W.	New Jersey.
Lawrence, J.	Kansas.
Lent, M. R.	New York.
Little, C. J.	Philadelphia.
Lore, Dallas D.	Genesee.
Lybrand, G. W.	Philadelphia.
McCullough, J. B.	Philadelphia.
McLoughlin, Jas.	Philadelphia.
McMillon, J.	Maine.
Milby, Arthur W.	Philadelphia.
Murphy, Thos. C.	Philadelphia.
Myers, Thos.	Baltimore.
Palmer, A. M.	Newark.
Parker, Jas. E.	Detroit.
Patterson, D. L.	Philadelphia.
Pilcher, E. H.	Detroit.
Reed, Seth	Detroit.
Rissell, Jno.	Detroit.

Name.	Conference.
Ruth, Jno.	Philadelphia.
Scott, Alex.	Pittsburgh.
Shaw, W. H.	Genesee.
Shove, Benj.	Oneida.
Smith, J. B.	Central Illinois.
Smith, Jos.	New York East.
Taylor, Jno. C.	Pittsburgh.
Taylor, W. H.	Central Ohio.
Thomas, S. W.	Philadelphia.
Thomas, C. F.	East Baltimore.
Torrence, I. H.	East Baltimore.
Virgin, E. W.	New England.
Wallace, H.	Newark.
Westwood, H. C.	Baltimore.
White, Jno. N.	
Whitney, Nelson	East Maine.
Williomas, T. J.	Newark.
Winslow, E. D.	New England.
Woods, F.	New England.
Woolston, B. F.	New Jersey.
Zimmerman, J.	Black River.

1864.

Alday, J. H.	Philadelphia.
Allen, John	Philadelphia.
Appleford, D.	Rock River.
Ashworth, J.	East Genesee.
Austin, C. H.	Black River.
Bockus, A. L.	Genesee.
Bailey, N. M.	New Hampshire.
Baker, A. S.	East Genesee.
Ballow, Geo. W.	Maine.
Barber, R. R.	Black River.
Barnes, J. B.	Black River.
Barns, R. M.	Southeastern Indiana.
Beale, S. H.	East Maine.
Beggs, S. R.	Rock River.
Bennett, H. W.	Black River.
Bennett, P. S.	Wisconsin.
Bent, G. R.	New England.
Bingham, I. S.	Black River.
Bixby, Wm.	Oneida.
Blakeslee, G. H.	Wyoming.

NAME.	CONFERENCE.
Boole, W. H.	New York East.
Booth, Jno. F.	New York East.
Boswell, W. L.	Philadelphia.
Bowen, C. M.	Black River.
Breckenridge, E. W.	Wyoming.
Brekenridge, J. S.	New York East.
Brindle, Jas. A.	Philadelphia.
Brooks, D.	Minnesota.
Brown, Azra	Cincinnati.
Brown, A. H.	Pittsburgh.
Brown, J. N.	Black River.
Buck, W. D.	Genesee.
Brown, S. E.	Black River.
Buck, J. H.	Black River.
Bull, J. M.	East Genesee.
Bwidick, C. F.	Troy.
Burr, W. N.	Oneida.
Burt, Sylvester	Pittsburgh.
Bush, E. G.	Oneida.
Callahan, D.	Cincinnati.
Campbell, Jno.	New York.
Carr, J. M.	Pittsburgh.
Castle, J. H.	Philadelphia.
Chapman, G. E.	New England.
Chase, L. N.	New Hampshire.
Chase, Moses	Providence.
Clark, J. L.	Western Virginia.
Clark, Jonas M.	New England.
Clarke, H. R.	
Clarke, W. R.	New England.
Clendenning, T. C.	Rock River.
Collins, H. B.	Southeastern Indiana.
Comfort, G.	Wyoming.
Cookman, A.	New York.
Cooper, Jas. W.	Philadelphia.
Copeland, A. T.	Black River.
Cordon, J. R.	Detroit.
Coyle, Jno.	Newark.
Cramer, M. J.	Cincinnati.
Cullis, Wm. B.	New Jersey.
Cunningham, J.	Philadelphia.
Cushing, S. A.	New England.
Dayon, J. F.	Black River.

NAME.	CONFERENCE.
De Forrest, J. A.	New Hampshire.
De Haas, F. S.	New York East.
Dobbins, J. B.	New Jersey.
Elliott, J. E.	Philadelphia.
England, G. A.	Wisconsin.
Erwin, J.	Black River.
Evans, J. G.	Central Illinois.
Faulks, J. B.	Newark.
Feather, J. B.	Western Virginia.
Fellows, Geo.	Wisconsin.
Ferguson, A. H.	New York.
Fletcher, J.	East Maine.
Foster, Boswell	East Maine.
Fox, C. S.	East Genesee.
Fox, H.	Oneida.
Fulford, D.	Black River.
Fuller, S. R.	Black River.
Gardiner, Austin	Providence.
Gardiner, L. M.	East Baltimore.
Gibson, O. L.	East Genesee.
Godfrey, A. C.	East Maine.
Gould, Albert	New England.
Graves, Prof. Jackson	Troy.
Gregg, W. B.	Philadelphia.
Haines, Selden	Des Moines.
Hall, E.	North Indiana.
Hall, Geo. A.	Troy.
Hamilton, S. L.	Central Illinois.
Hardy, J. B.	Iowa.
Harlow, R. W.	Vermont.
Hartsough, L.	Oneida.
Hascall, W. M.	East Genesee.
Hatfield, R. M.	New York East.
Hawes, Edw.	Indiana.
Hawks, Jno.	Maine.
Haynes, Z. S.	Vermont.
(Hill, J. B.)	
Hobart, G.	Northwest Wisconsin.
(Holmes, J. M.)	
Hopkins, S. M.	Genesee.
Hull, J. F.	Cincinnati.
Hunt, S.	Genesee.
Irwin, Jos. L.	Western Virginia.

NAME.	CONFERENCE.
Jamison, J. M.	Ohio.
Jaques, Parker	Maine.
Jewell, F. F.	Black River.
Johnson, Thos. S.	Illinois.
Jones, J. F.	Pittsburgh.
Jones, N.	Genesee.
Kennedy, S. Y.	Pittsburgh.
Kenyon, S. F.	Black River.
King, J. D.	Providence.
King, S. W.	New York East.
(Kline, J. A.)	
Kmett, J. B.	East Genesee.
Knowles, J. H.	Genesee.
Knox, J. D.	Pittsburgh.
La Croix, Prof. P. J.	Ohio.
Lane, J. W.	Southern Illinois.
Lathrop, C. G.	Wisconsin.
Lawrence, Jno.	Kansas.
Leake, Thos.	Rock River.
Legate, O. M.	Black River.
Little, C. E.	Troy.
Little, J. S.	Vermont.
Littlewood, T.	New York East.
Luce, Israel	Vermont.
Lytle, David	Troy.
Manning, Wm.	East Genesee.
Markliam, W. F.	Cincinnati.
Marlay, J. F.	Cincinnati.
Marsh, J.	Erie.
Marshall, W. K.	Pittsburgh.
Martindale, T. E.	Philadelphia.
Mason, C. C.	Maine.
Mason, J.	Cincinnati.
Mast, Isaac	Philadelphia.
McAllister, Wm.	New York East.
McAnn, Isaac	Vermont.
McClelland, J. F.	Philadelphia.
McCullough, J. B.	Philadelphia.
McDonald, Wm.	Providence.
McDowall, O. M.	Wyoming.
McLaughlin, G. W.	Philadelphia.
Mead, A. P.	Rock River.
Metcalf, Jno. E.	Vermont.

NAME.	CONFERENCE.
Miller, J. V. R.	North Indiana.
Mitchell, Jno.	Maine.
Moore, James D.	East Baltimore.
Morell, J. F.	New Jersey.
Morris, G. K.	New Jersey.
Morrinson, J. B.	Southeastern Indiana.
Morton, A. D.	Erie.
Munger, E. H.	Black River.
Murphy, T. C.	Philadelphia.
Newell, C. H.	New England.
Newhouse, J. E.	Northwest Indiana.
Nichols, Starr	East Genesee.
Noble, C.	New England.
Norris, W. H.	New York East.
Owen, A.	New Jersey.
Paine, J. L.	Upper Iowa.
Parker, Jno.	East Genesee.
Parrott, Geo.	Cincinnati.
Parsons, S.	Newark.
Patterson, Samuel	Philadelphia.
Peck, Luther,	Wyoming.
Petty, A. L.	Pittsburgh.
Pratt, A. L.	Vermont.
Quigley, Geo.	Philadelphia.
Ramsdell, S. L.	Detroit.
Rauks, Swanton	Maine.
Reasoner, J. R.	Kentucky.
Reed, J. C.	Northwest Indiana.
Requa, Henry	Wisconsin.
Reynolds, J. F.	Philadelphia.
Ritchie, H.	Central Illinois.
Roberts, J. W.	Philadelphia.
Roberts, Robert	Southern Indiana.
Robertson, D. A.	Southern Indiana.
Robinson, J. M.	Cincinnati.
Robinson, R. S.	Iowa.
Robinson, W. J.	East Maine.
Rose, R. S.	Wyoming.
Salisbury, A. B.	Genesee.
Satchwell, H. P.	New England.
Scott, A.	Pittsburgh.
Sharp, J. M. C.	Southeastern Indiana.
Shaw, L. L.	East Maine.

Name.	Conference.
Shelling, Chas.	Genesee.
Shier, Wm. H.	Detroit.
Shinn, John	Cincinnati.
Simonson, W. H.	New York East.
Smith, B.	North Indiana.
Smith, C. W.	Pittsburgh.
Smith, G. A.	Wisconsin.
Smith, D.	Northwest Indiana.
Smith, H.	Troy.
Spencer, F. A.	Ohio.
Steley, E. H.	Northwest Indiana.
Steele, G. M.	New England.
Stivers, T. S.	Ohio.
Stowe, G.	Detroit.
Stubbs, R. S.	New Hampshire.
Sutton, Jos. S.	Detroit.
Tait, T. B.	Erie.
Taplin, G. P.	Vermont.
Taylor, B. F.	Upper Iowa.
Taylor, H. B.	Southern Illinois.
Taylor, J. C.	Pittsburgh.
Teed, David	Rock River.
Thomas, C. F.	East Baltimore.
Thomas, S. W.	Philadelphia.
Thompson, J. J.	Cincinnati.
Tiffony, W. H.	Troy.
Tonsey, Thos.	East Genesee.
Townsend, G. H.	Vermont.
Tuttle, J. K.	East Genesee.
Vrooman, J.	Troy.
Warner, H.	Vermont.
Warner, P.	Central Illinois.
Warren, H. W.	New England.
Watkins, W. F.	New York East.
Wells, M. S.	Oneida.
Westwood, H. C.	Baltimore.
Wheeler, H.	Wyoming.
(White, A.)	
Whitney, Nelson	East Maine.
Whitlock, Prof. W. F.	Central Ohio.
Widmer, F.	Troy.
Williams, H. G.	New Jersey.
Williams, J. R.	Indiana.

Name.	Conference.
Wilson, B. F.	Missouri and Arkansas.
Wohlgemuth, W.	East Genesee.
Wood, A.	New Hampshire.
Woodruff, G. W.	New York East.
Young, Wm.	Cincinnati.

1865.

Alabaster, J.	East Genesee.
Badgley, O.	Newark.
Baker, Jno. E.	Wisconsin.
Ball, F.	Western Virginia.
Bancroft, Geo. C.	Vermont.
Barkdull, T. N.	Central Ohio.
Barnes, D. F.	Northwest Indiana.
Bartels, Jno.	Central Illinois.
Beatty, Robert	Erie.
Benham, W. R.	East Genesee.
Bolles, S.	Minnesota.
Bower, A.	Central Illinois.
Boyd, R. B.	Erie.
Bradley, Wm.	East Genesee.
Brigham, Alf.	Wyoming.
Brooks, C. W.	Wisconsin.
Brown, S. E.	Black River.
Brown, W. N.	Upper Iowa.
Bryont, Geo. W.	New Hampshire.
Buckles, L. C.	Northwest Indiana.
Capen, Jno. S.	New England.
Carroll, Geo. K.	New York East.
Chamberlayne, C. S.	Genesee.
Clark, D. W. (Bishop)	
Coult, A. C.	New Hampshire.
Crafts, F. A.	Providence.
Damon, A. N.	Black River.
Dinsmore, C. M.	New Hampshire.
Eddy, C.	Genesee.
Edwards, H. B.	Pittsburgh.
Farrington, W. F.	Providence.
Fitch (New York Mills, N. Y.)	New York.
Foster, A.	Wisconsin.
Foster, Jno. Q.	Rock River.
Fuller, A.	Black River.
Furler, Franklin	New England.

NAME.	CONFERENCE.
Gale, Solomon (G.)	New York.
Gee, A. A.	Northwest Indiana.
Gill, J.	Vermont.
Graves, Horace	Black River.
Graves, W. P.	Central Illinois.
Grumley, E. S.	Wisconsin.
Hall, Jno. H.	Oneida.
Hartley, W. S.	Cincinnati.
Hartupee, G. H.	North Ohio.
Hawes, Edw.	Indiana.
Hawkins, L.	Rock River.
Henderson, J. R.	Central Ohio.
Henson, Jos.	New York East.
Hitchcock, J. C.	East Genesee.
Hitchens, Geo.	New Jersey.
Hobbs, H. A.	Central Illinois.
Horton, A. A.	Erie.
Hotchkiss, E.	East Genesee.
Hoyt, James	Michigan.
Hunt, A. S.	New York East.
Irwin, G. M.	Central Illinois.
Janes, E. S. (Bishop)	
Johnson, W. C.	Philadelphia.
Johnson, W. W.	Michigan.
Jones, W.	East Genesee.
King, C. A.	Maine.
Klepper, J. W.	Minnesota.
Lathrop, E.	Kentucky.
Lawson, Jas.	West Wisconsin.
Lee, Geo. D.	Michigan.
Loriusberry, H.	New York.
Lowe, Geo. W.	Detroit.
Lyon, C. W.	New York.
Marlay, J. F.	Cincinnati.
Martin, H. L.	Rock River.
Martin, J. W.	Rock River.
Martin, N. H.	New England.
Mason, J. W.	Cincinnati.
McCabe, C. C.	Ohio.
McClain, J. F.	Southeastern Indiana.
McLean, C. F.	Upper Iowa.
Meharry, A.	Cincinnati.
Meville, J. H.	New England.

Appendix.

Name.	Conference.
Moore, J. H.	Illinois.
Nadal, B. H.	Baltimore.
Norton, J. D.	Erie.
Osborne, W. M.	West Wisconsin.
Patterson, Robert	Troy.
Pearne, T. H.	Holston.
Pike, J.	New Hampshire.
Picher, J. N.	Ohio.
Porter, Jeremiah	New England.
Potter, Wm.	East Genesee.
Prettyman, W.	Ohio.
Ritchie, H.	Central Illinois.
Robbins, J. C.	Wisconsin.
Ross, Jas. H.	East Genesee.
Smith, Jesse	Minnesota.
Smith, Wm. A.	Rock River.
Stevenson, T.	Southern Illinois.
Taylor, G. L.	New York East.
Taylor, J. D.	Central Illinois.
Tinsley, Chas.	Southeastern Indiana.
Tupper, Samuel	New England.
Vance, Jos.	Cincinnati.
Viele, A.	Troy.
Virgin, E. W.	New England.
Wallser, T.	Wisconsin.
Wallace, H.	Illinois.
Wasmuth, E.	Central Illinois.
Waters, W. G.	Central Ohio.
Wayne, Jos.	Genesee.
Wells, M. L.	Southeastern Indiana.
Wheeler, A.	North Ohio.
Wight, W. H.	Vermont.
Williams, M.	Erie.

APPENDIX C.

Letter to Jefferson Davis By a Confederate Officer, Concerning Bishop Ames.

Office of Commissary of Substance
and Quartermaster Cavalry Brigade.
Gainesville, Prince William Co., Va.
February 5, 1862.

His Excellency Jefferson Davis,
President of the Confederate States.

Sir: I hope you will pardon this intrusion. A sense of duty impels me to write to you and, if you will not consider it presumption, utter a word of warning. I see that Rev. Bishop Ames, of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States has accepted the appointment as one of the proposed visitors and inspectors of Richmond prisoners of war and their prisons. I know not whether they will be allowed to enter our lines and prosecute their mission or not. I do, however, know Bishop Ames. He has been for many years a shrewd and potent politician. I am myself a Methodist preacher and have been for nineteen years. I have been a member of the Baltimore Conference stationed for some years past in Baltimore and Washington cities. I was in charge of a congregation in Baltimore when our present troubles burst forth upon us. I resigned my congregation in June and came to my native Virginia to do whatever I might for her and the South. I was immediately called into the activities of the present struggle,—first as a lieutenant in a company of mounted riflemen, then through Col. J. E. Stuart's solicitations and recommendation you gave me the appointment of

chaplain to the First Virginia Cavalry, and subsequently my present position upon General J. E. B. Stuart's staff as major and chief of staff to his brigade. Excuse this apparent announcement of myself rather than another, about whom I proposed writing. I hope it will enable you the better to appreciate the feeble monitions I desire to express and the motives that prompt it.

For many years the Methodist Episcopal Church, of which I am an humble minister, has been fearfully agitated and cursed by the same class of fanatics that have now brought this terrible disaster upon the Nation. It was in vain that we of the border strove to stem this maddened current. It swept onward and onward despite all varieties of pleadings and remonstrances, bearing down one safeguard after another, till it reached its culmination in the legislation of our late General Conference, held in Buffalo last May one year. Subsequently the ministers and the laity of our Conference voted themselves from under the jurisdiction of the said General Conference. In all this protracted controversy Bishop Ames's sympathies, and indeed most of our bishops were with the North. I know Bishop Ames to be an uncompromising anti-slavery man, not to say abolitionist. He with other members of the bench of bishops sought to impress upon the present President of the United States and his Cabinet upon their accession to power the fact that the Methodist Church, very numerous in the North and West, had peculiar claims upon the Government for a liberal share of the spoils of office, as they had so largely contributed to Mr. Lincoln's election, at the same time disavowing any particular claim upon the outgoing administration. I might detail many facts to corroborate this representation of the dangerous and corrupt antecedents of this high Church dignitary, but I fear it might weary you. Suffice it to say that I am positively certain, from personal knowledge, that Bishop Ames, with many others whom I might name of

high position in our Church in the North, have aided most fearfully by the influence of their position and their known sentiments to augment the power of the abolition party in the North, and to precipitate the horrid and unnatural alienation and bloody war in which we are now engaged. We are now forced to the terrible necessity in the vindication and defense of our most sacred and cherished rights to sacrifice many of the best and noblest of our brothers upon freedom's altars; but let us meanwhile beware of those who have forced us into this attitude of defense against the most iniquitous and oppressive tyranny ever attempted to be imposed upon an enlightened people.

Allow me, in conclusion, Mr. President, to warn you against this astute politician, who in the garb of a Christian minister and with the specious plea of "humanity" upon his lips, would insinuate himself into the very heart of that Government whose very foundation he would most gladly sap and destroy. You can make any use of this letter your judgment dictates, and if you deem it worthy of attention you will pardon the liberty I have taken in view of the patriotic motives which have prompted it. I respectfully refer you to Wyndham Robertson, Esq., of your city, if you deem it necessary to know me further before considering the information I have communicated.

Most respectfully, your obedient servant,

DARBEY BALL.

From the "Official Records," Series II, vol. iii, pp. 787, 788.

APPENDIX D.

Patriotic Addresses of Bishop Simpson.

The bishop began his lecture in the Academy of Music in New York in 1864 by saying:

"I would stand far above all party; I have no epithets for any of my fellow-citizens. [As it was his purpose to give his discourse a firm body of logic, he outlined four possible issues of the war.] First: It is a possible result of this conflict that we may become a prey to some foreign powers and be reduced under their control. There is a second possible result of this contest: that the Nation may be divided into two or more separate confederacies. There is a third possible issue: that the Nation may remain united, but with its present institutions overthrown, and Southern institutions and Southern ideas established. The fourth and last possible issue is that our Nation, having passed through this fiery ordeal, may come out of it purer, stronger, and more glorious than ever before. At this point I will simply say that I believe it to be the design of Providence to secure the last result. Taking up the first topic. No great nation has, in all history, risen and fallen in a single century. Moreover, there are indications to show that this is destined to be a great Nation in the earth. The discovery of America by Columbus, at the time thereof, was opportune. This Nation has done more than any other to fulfill a great destiny. One thing it has done towards the accomplishment of its work is the education of the masses. In this land all may rise to the highest offices. The humblest cabin-boy may lead our armies, and the poor hostler may sit in the Senate. Who has not heard of Henry Clay, the

Millboy of the Slashes, and Jackson, the child of poor Irish parents! And some may have heard that even a rail-splitter may become President! Again, this Nation is an asylum for all the nations of the earth. There is no large migration to any other land, but men come here from all parts of the world. I have no feeling of sympathy with any person who will seek to exclude from free national association all who may come. We have broad acres for them to cultivate, schools for their children and churches for themselves, and a Constitution broad enough, thank God! and strong enough for all the world to stand upon. This Nation has the sympathy of the masses all over the earth, and if the world is to be raised to its proper place, I would say it with all reverence, God can not do without America.

"Then comes the second question, Shall the Nation be divided? If we divide, where shall we divide? We have no mountain chains, no great natural landmarks to separate us into two; and if we divide, must it not be into several confederacies? If you allow the South to go, then the Northwest will become a separate confederacy; and when the Northwest undertakes that, the people of the Pacific Coast will set up for themselves, and you will lose all that gold-bearing country. I tell you here today, I would not give one cent on the dollar for your National liabilities if you allow a single dividing line to be run through your country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I deprecate war, it is terrible; much of the best blood of the Nation has flowed, and more, possibly, will moisten the earth; but if we should divide this land into petty sections, there will come greater strife, which will waste the blood of your children and grandchildren, and there will be sorrow and wailing throughout the generations to come. When I look at this dark picture, much as I dislike war, I yet say, better now fight for twenty years and have peace than stop where we are. If any peace is had, I want a peace which shall be last-

ing, so that I can leave my wife and children safe when I die, and that can only be by our remaining a united Nation. We have glorious boundaries on the north and the south, on the east and the west, and when I look at those boundaries I say, 'Palsied be the hand which shall try to wrest from us one foot of this great domain.'

"Then the question comes, 'Shall our form of government be changed?' This is what Mr. Davis expects; he can hardly suppose the South will live in separation. They at the South expected that this great city would declare itself independent; but this city has a heart that throbs in sympathy with the Nation, and stands out, as it ought, as the National metropolis. The South hopes for a monarchy, but this Nation will never tolerate a monarchy.

"If these three results are not likely to happen, then shall we, as a people, emerge from this contest purer and more glorious than before. The Nation must be purified, and for that we are going through the war. The war is nothing new; the South has been preparing for it for thirty years. At the same time a series of providences has appeared which shows the hand of God.

"I have one more impression, that if this war lasts much longer slavery will be damaged. It is seriously damaged now, and I hope and desire that it may pass away quickly and let us see the last of it. Do you ask what has been accomplished? The District of Columbia has been made free, and this week—on the last Tuesday—the sun, as it rose, shone for the first time on the glorious State of Maryland. West Virginia, from her mountain home, echoes back the shouts of freedom. But this war ought not to be carried on for the purpose of destroying slavery, or for any other than the single purpose of restoring the authority of our Government. But if, while we are striking blows at the rebellion, slavery will come and put its black head between us and the rebels, then let it perish along with them. Our chil-

dren can look back to the battles of the Revolution and assure themselves that their fathers were worthy of freedom. Let the children of these poor slaves have the chance to look back not only to Fort Pillow, but to the battles fought and won in front of Petersburg and Richmond, and they will feel that they, too, are worthy of freedom. It has been demonstrated in this war that a blue coat can make a hero even of a sable skin. The black men have long ago learned to follow the stars; they have followed the North Star successfully, and now it is shown that they can follow, as well as any others, the stars that are set in our glorious flag.

"Your Fifty-fifth Regiment carried this flag [taking up a war-worn, shot-riddled flag, which was greeted with tremendous cheers]; it has been at Newbern, and at South Mountain, and at Antietam. The blood of our brave boys is upon it; the bullets of rebels have gone through and through it; yet it is the same old flag. Our fathers followed that flag; we expect that our children and our children's children will follow it; there is nothing on earth like that old flag for beauty. Long may those stars shine! Just now there are clouds upon it and mists gathering around it, but the stars are coming out, and others are joining them. And they grow brighter and brighter, and so may they shine till the last star in the heavens shall fall!"[1]

Oration of Bishop Simpson at the Grave of Lincoln.

"Fellow-Citizens of Illinois and Many Parts of Our Entire Union: Near the capital of this large and growing State of Illinois, in the midst of this beautiful grove, and at the open mouth of the vault which has just received the remains of our fallen chieftain, we gather to pay a tribute of respect and drop the tears of sorrow. A little more than four years ago he left

[1] Crooks, "Life of Simpson," pp. 379-383.

his plain and quiet home in yonder city, receiving the parting words of the concourse of friends who in the midst of the droppings of a gentle shower gathered around him. He spoke of the pain of leaving the place where his children had been born, and where his home had been rendered so pleasant by many recollections. And as he left he made an earnest request in the hearing of some who are present at this hour, that as he was about to enter upon responsibilities which he believed to be greater than those which had fallen upon any man since the days of Washington, the people would offer up their prayers that God would aid and sustain him in the work they had given him to do. His company left your city; but as it went, snares were set for the Chief Magistrate. Scarcely did he escape the dangers of the way or the hand of the assassin as he neared Washington. I believe he escaped only through the vigilance of the officers and the prayers of the people, so that the blow was suspended for more than four years, which was at last permitted, through the providence of God, to fall.

"How different the occasion which witnessed his departure from that which witnessed his return! Doubtless you expected to take him by the hand, to feel the warm grasp which you felt in other days, and to see the tall form among you which you had delighted to honor in years past. But he was never permitted to return until he came with lips mute, his frame encoffined, and a weeping Nation following. Such a scene as his return to you was never witnessed. Among the events of history there have been great processions of mourners. There was one for the Patriarch Jacob, which went out of Egypt, and the Canaanites wondered at the evidence of reverence and filial affection which came from the hearts of the Israelites. There was mourning when Moses fell upon the heights of Pisgah and was hid from human view. There has been mourning in the

kingdoms of the earth when kings and princes have fallen. But never was there in the history of man such mourning as that which has attended this progress to the grave. If we look at the multitudes that followed him we can see how the Nation stood aghast when it heard of his death. Tears filled the eyes of manly, sunburned faces. Strong men, as they grasped the hands of their friends, were unable to find vent for their grief in words. Women and children caught up the tidings as they ran through the land, and were melted into tears. The Nation stood still. Men left their plows in the fields and asked what the end should be. The hum of manufactories ceased, and the sound of the hammer was not heard. Busy merchants closed their doors, and in the Exchange gold passed no more from hand to hand. Though three weeks have elapsed, the Nation has scarcely breathed easily. Men of all political parties and of all religious creeds have united in paying this tribute. The archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church in New York and a Protestant minister walked side by side in the sad procession, and a Jewish rabbi performed a part of the solemn service. Here are gathered around his tomb the representatives of the army and navy, senators, judges, and officers of all the branches of the Government. Here, too, are members of civic professions, with men and women from the humblest as well as the highest occupations. Here and there, too, are tears—as sincere and warm as any that drop—which come from the eyes of whose kindred and whose race have been freed from their chains by him whom they mourn as their deliverer. More races have looked on the procession for sixteen hundred miles—by night and by day, by sunlight, dawn, twilight, and by torchlight—than ever before watched the progress of a procession on its way to the grave.

"A part of this deep interest has arisen from the times in which we live and in which he who has fallen was a leading actor. It is a principle of our nature

that feelings, once excited, turn readily from the object by which they are aroused to some other object, which may for the time being take possession of the mind. Another law of our nature is that our deepest affections gather about some human form in which are incarnated the living thoughts of the age. If we look, then, at the times, we see an age of excitement. [These thoughts were copiously illustrated.]

"The tidings came that Richmond was evacuated, and that Lee had surrendered. The bells rang merrily all over the land. The booming of cannon was heard; illuminations and torchlight processions manifested the general joy, and families looked for the speedy return of their loved ones from the field. Just in the midst of this, in one hour—nay, in one moment—the news was flashed throughout the land that Abraham Lincoln had perished by the hand of an assassin; and then all the feeling which had been gathering for four years, in forms of excitement, grief, horror, joy, turned into one wail of woe—a sadness inexpressible. But it is not the character of the times, merely, which has made this mourning; the mode of his death must be taken into the account. Had he died with kind friends around him; had the sweat of death been wiped from his brow by gentle hands while he was yet conscious—how it would have softened or assuaged something of our grief! But no moment of warning was given to him or to us. He was stricken down, too, when his hopes for the end of the rebellion were bright, and prospects of a calmer life were before him. There was a Cabinet meeting that day, said to have been the most cheerful of any held since the beginning of the rebellion. After this meeting he talked with his friends, and spoke of the four years of tempest, of the storm being over, and of the four years of content now awaiting him, as the weight of care and anxiety would be taken from his mind. In the midst of these anticipations he left his house, never

to return alive. The evening was Good Friday, the saddest day in the whole calendar for the Christian Church. So filled with grief was every Christian heart that even the joyous thoughts of Easter Sunday failed to remove the sorrow under which the true worshiper bowed in the house of God.

"But the chief reason for this mourning is to be found in the man himself. [Here follows a summary of the character of Lincoln.]

"Standing, as we do to-day, by his coffin, let us resolve to carry forward the policy so nobly begun. Let us do right to all men. Let us vow, before heaven, to eradicate every vestage of human slavery; to give every human being his true position before God and man; to crush every form of rebellion, and to stand by the flag which God has given us. How joyful that it floated over parts of every State before Mr. Lincoln's career was ended! How singular that to the fact of the assassin's heel being caught in the folds of the flag we are probably indebted for his capture. The time will come when, in the beautiful words of him whose lips are now forever sealed, 'the mystic chords of memory, which stretch from every battlefield and from every patriot's grave, shall yield a sweeter music when touched by the angels of our better nature.'

"Chieftain, farewell! The Nation mourns thee. Mothers shall teach thy name to their lisping children. The youth of our land shall emulate thy virtues. Statesmen shall study thy record, and from it learn lessons of wisdom. Mute though thy lips be, yet they still speak. Hushed is thy voice, but its echoes of liberty are ringing through the world, and the sons of bondage listen with joy. Thou didst fall not for thyself. The assassin had no hate for thee. Our hearts were aimed at; our National life was sought. We crown thee as our martyr, and Humanity enthrones thee as her triumphant son. Hero, martyr, friend, farewell!"

APPENDIX E.

Preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in the Confederate Army.

The statement has been commonly made that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was as loyal to the Confederate cause as was the Methodist Episcopal Church to the cause of the Union, and a careful investigation of the facts will bear out this statement. I have made a list of the Methodist (South) chaplains in the Confederate Army, though it is far from complete, owing to the fact that a number of the Southern Conferences did not meet during the war, and also to the fact that the Minutes of several of the Conferences which did hold their sessions were lost. This list by Conferences is as follows:

TENNESSEE CONFERENCE.[1]

Pitts, Fountain E.
Ellis, John A.
Cullom, Jeremiah W.
Edmondson, K. A.
Stephens, Berry M.
Richey, James H.
Cherry, Sterling M.
Kimball, Francis A.
Hamilton Alex. F.
Whitten, Moses L.
Purtle, John M.
Williams, Marcus G.
Hunter, R. S.
Cross, Joseph.
Bailey, William M.
Tribber, Allen.
Wilson, R. A.
Petway, F. S.
Browning, W. H.
Gould, J. H.
Lovell, J. W.
Smith, B. F.
Bolton, J. G.
Harrison, J. G.

HOLSTON CONFERENCE.

Bowman, W. C.
Sullins, D.
Manpin, Milton.
Wiggins, Joseph A.
Wexler, Edwin C.
Farley, Francis A.
Callahan, George W.

[1] There were no sessions of the Tennessee Conference in 1863 or 1864, and the above list is for the two first years of the war only.

Glenn, Thos. F.
Waugh, Henry P.
Stringfield, J. K.

MEMPHIS CONFERENCE.[1]

Crouch, Benj. T.
Hamilton, Ephraim E.
Fife, J. A.
Owen, Wm. B.
Payne, Wm. S.
Haskell, Wm. C.
Bwins, R. H.
Ford, Miles H.
Duke, Thos. L.
Deavenport, Thos. H.
McCutchen, Jos. B.
Mahon, Wm. J.
Porter, Robt. G.
Pearson, W. G.
McIver, J. W.
Johnson, W. C.

MISSISSIPPI CONFERENCE.

Godfrey, James A.
Swinney, S. T.
Ard, J. W.
Richardson, J. P.
Mortimer, Geo. J.
Ely, Foster.
Johnson, Pickney A.
Nicholson, A. B.
Young, Newton B.
Boyls, Geo. W.

LOUISIANA CONFERENCE.[2]

White, Fredrick.

VIRGINIA CONFERENCE.

Granberry, J. C.
Joyner, James E.
August, P. F.
Berry, Wm. W.
Woggoner, James R.
McSparran, James E.
Anderson, J. M.
Booker, Geo. E.
Fitzpatrick, Jas. B.
Garland, Jas. P.
Edwards, Wm. E.
Hardee, Robert, Jr.
Duncan, Wm. W.
Ware, Thos. A.
Bledsoe, Adam C.
Beodles, Robt. B.
Hoyle, Samuel V.
Lafferty, John J.
Spiller, Benj. C.
Hammond, Wesley C.
Blackwell, John D.
Wheelwright, W. H.

WEST VIRGINIA CONFERENCE.[3]

NORTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE.

Betts, A. D.
Brent, O. J.
Buie, John D.
Robbins, Jeffrey H.
Wood, Franklin H.
Webb, Richard S.
Dodson, C. C.
Plyler, Calvin.
Richardson, W. B.
Hines, J. J.
Alford, A. B.
Moore, Wm. H.
Wilson, E. A.
Pepper, C. M.
Long, J. S.
Gutfrie, Benj. F.

---

[1] No Minutes for 1864.

[2] There are no records for 1862, 1863, 1864. The number of chaplains from this Conference, very probably, much larger than here indicated.

[3] There are no records of the Conference during the war.

Appendix.

South Carolina Conference.

Fleming, Wm. H.
Stephens, Alex. B.
Ervin, James S.
Power, Wm. C.
Allston, Robt. B.
Miller, John W.
Hemmingway, W. A.
Meynardie, Chas. J.
Black, Wm. S.
Kennedy, Francis M.
Thompson, Eugene W.
Tart, James H.
Wells, Geo. H.
Snow, J. J.
Brown, M.
Campbell, James B.
Moore, H. D.
Wells, A. N.
Moore, A. W.
Johnson, L. A.
Hill, S. J.
Mood, F. A.

Georgia Conference.

Jordan, Thos. H.
Reynolds, John A.
Smith, Geo. G.
Washburn, John H.
Yarbrough, Geo. W.
Simmons, Wm. A.
Cone, Wm. H. C.
Talley, John W.
Jackson, James B.
Boland, Elijah N.
Kramer, Geo.
Thigpen, Alex. M.
Strickland, John.
Oslin, W. W.
Dunlap, W. C.
Rush, L.
Sparks, J. O. A.
Cook, J. O. A.
Troywick, J. W.
Dodge, Wm. A.
Jarrell, Anderson J.
Malony, Wm. C.
Lesler, Robt. B.

Alabama Conference.

McBryde, Alexander.
Campbell, James M.
Andrews, A. S.
Wier, T. C.
McVoy, A. D.
Perry, W. G.
Grace, J. J.
Jones, A. M.
Stone, J. B.
Feith, Wm.
Johnson, W. G.
Ellis, C. C.
Connerly, D. C. B.
Rutledge, Thos. C.
Gillis, Neil.
Talley, Geo. R.
McFerrin, J. P.
Wardlow, F. A.
Norton, W. F.
Selman, B. L.

Mobile Conference.

Perry, J. W.
Gregory, J. T. M.
Kavanaugh, H. H.
Fikes, A. M.
Stone, H. C.
McGeher, Lucius.

Florida Conference.

Truberlake, John W.
Pratt, Geo. W.
Kennedy, Wm. M.
Wiggins, Robert L.
Evans, Robert F.

Texas Conference.

Perry, Benj. F.
Cox, F. J.
Brooks, C. H.

Ray, E. P.
Addison, O. M.
Phillips, P.
Parks, W. A.
Glass, H. M.

East Texas Conference.[1]

Stovall, David M.
Collins, W. C.
Hill, Wm. B.
Joyce, W. J.
Smith, John C.
Manion, A. B.
Robbins, W. M.

Wachita Conference.

Ratcliffe, Wm. P.
Winfield, Augustus R.
Jewel, Horace.
Chamberlain, Wm. A.
Harvey, James R.
Tyson, Thos. S.
Davis, Wm. J.
Johnson, L. H.
Harrison, E. R.
Wells, M. H.
Johnson, B. G.
Evans, G. W.

Arkansas Conference.

Roberts, R. R.
Mackey, James.
Williams, J. A.
Lee, B.
Harris, Benoni.
Rice, John H.

No Minutes were returned for the Missouri, St. Louis, Kansas Mission, or the Pacific Conferences during the four years of the war. A number of ministers of the Church South from West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri became chaplains in the Union Army, and twelve of their names appear in the lists of Union chaplains.

This list of Confederate chaplains from the Methodist Episcopal Church South totals 209. The large numbers contributed by some of the Southern Conferences is surprising. The Tennessee Conference contributed 24; the Virginia and South Carolina, 22 each; Georgia Conference, 23; the Albany, 20; the Memphis, 16; and the North Carolina, 15.

Besides these regular chaplains a considerable number of ministers went as missionaries to the Confederate armies, performing duties similar to those performed by the ministerial delegates of the United States Christian Commission.

[1] The Minutes of this Conference for 1862 and 1863 were not turned in for publication. They are probably lost.

Appendix.

The names of these missionaries and their Conferences are:

HOLSTON CONFERENCE.
Dickey, J. W.

MISSISSIPPI CONFERENCE.
Wheat, John J.
Harrington, Whitfield.
Shelton, James H.
Andrews, C. Green.
Hummeutt, Wm. F. C.

VIRGINIA CONFERENCE.
Rosser, Leonidas.
Granberry, John C.

GEORGIA CONFERENCE.
Yarbrough, Geo. W.
Payne, E. B.
Stewart, Thos. H.
Thigpen, Alex. M.
McGehee, J. W.
Pierce, Thomas F.
Turner, J. W.
Lester, Robt. B.
Harbin, T. B.

ALABAMA CONFERENCE.
Hutchinson, J. J.
Brandon, F. T. J.
Hamill, E. J.
Edwards, Wm. B.
Taturn, I. L.
Dabbs, C. L.
Parker, J. A.

FLORIDA CONFERENCE.
Duncan, Erastus B.
Giles, Enoch H.

TEXAS CONFERENCE.
Seat, W. H.
South, H. W.
Glass, H. M.
Cook, T. F.
Ahrens, J. B.

WACHITA CONFERENCE.
McKennon, H. D.

The work of the Methodist chaplains in the Confederate armies was very similar to that already described in the Northern armies. It is stated that "unusual religious interest" prevailed in the army of Northern Virginia, it being especially pronounced in "Stonewall" Jackson's corps. "Jackson's men built log chapels for regular services, and their general aided religious work among them, taking pains to provide them with chaplains. General Lee did the same, and not only his chaplains, but his chief of artillery, General William A. Pendleton, held services and preached every Sunday and during the week as well, whenever the army was not fighting or marching. Prayer-meetings and revivals were common in camps, and at these generals were as

active and conspicuous as in a battle. Itinerant preachers and 'circuit riders' were guests always welcomed and better treated than any other visitors.''[1]

Large numbers of the preachers of the Church South who died during the war were or had been chaplains in the Confederate army or had been connected with the war more or less intimately, the death of most of them being directly due to this cause.[2]

Not only were there large numbers of preachers from the Church South serving as chaplains in the Confederate armies, as we have seen, but also an exceptionally large number of them were to be found as commissioned officers and in the ranks. I have gone through the Minutes of the Conferences of the Church South for the war, and have compiled the following table of preachers who were not chaplains but were serving the Confederacy in the capacity of ordinary soldiers or officers:

Tennessee Conference	13
Holston Conference	2
Memphis Conference	10
Mississippi Conference	12
Louisiana Conference	1
Virginia Conference	9
North Carolina Conference	7
South Carolina Conference	14
Georgia Conference	14
Alabama Conference	19
Florida Conference	8
Rio Grande Conference	5
Texas Conference	16
Wachita Conference	11
Total	141

[1] ''The Civil War from a Southern Standpoint,'' by W. R. Garrett and R. A. Halley,'' p. 338.

[2] This information is gained from the memoirs of deceased members, found in Volume II of General Minutes of the Church South.

Appendix.

This list is incomplete, owing to the fact that there are no records for several of the Conferences. It is very probably true that there were at least as many Methodist preachers in the Southern armies serving as soldiers (non-chaplains) as in the Union armies.

Petitions Favoring Change of Rule.

Conference.	Memorials.	Q. C.	Memorialists
Black River	145	..	10,827
Cincinnati	2	..	158
Delaware	2	..	72
Detroit	38	1	1,851
Erie	21	2	1,340
East Genesee	86	..	5,210
East Maine	13	..	307
Genesee	55	1	2,193
Illinois	1	..	10
Iowa	5	..	468
Maine	10	..	338
Michigan	53	..	2,477
Minnesota	3	..	143
Newark	1	..	18
New England	18	1	584
New Hampshire	23	..	752
New York East	5	..	141
Northern Indiana	9	..	1,519
North Ohio	21	..	1,544
N. W. Indiana	1	..	83
Ohio	1	..	23
Oneida	116	..	6,439
Peoria	10	..	532
Providence	24	43	977
Pittsburgh	1	1	127
Rock River	20	..	1,390
S. E. Indiana	2	..	195
Troy	8	..	375
Upper Iowa	10	..	438
Vermont	15	..	413
W. Wisconsin	26	..	1,204
Wisconsin	53	..	2,734
Wyoming	13	..	850
Local preachers' memorials	...	..	112
33 Conferences.	811	49	45,857

Petitions Against Change.

Conference.	Memorials.	Q. C.	Memorialists
Baltimore	3	..	69
Black River	1	..	17
Detroit	1	1	8
East Baltimore	4	..	281
East Genesee	1	..	13
Genesee	1	..	28
Illinois	9	..	574
Kansas and Nebraska	1	..	24
Kentucky	1	..	104
Maine	1	..	13
Michigan	3	..	94
Missouri	3	..	118
Newark	6	32	297
New England	2	..	13
New Hampshire	1	..	35
New Jersey	3	..	50
New York	12	..	330
New York East	58	..	1,382
North Ohio	1	..	24
Ohio	...	1	.....
Oneida	1	12	16
Peoria	1	..	3
Philadelphia	3	..	102
Providence	4	..	32
Rock River	3	..	19
Southern Illinois	1	..	57
Southeastern Indiana	...	1	.....
Troy	8	..	167
West Virginia	1	..	72
Upper Iowa	1	..	18
Wisconsin	1	..	11
Wyoming	1	..	29
32 Conferences.	137	47	3,999

INDEX.

A

American Bible Society, 166-168.
Ames, Bishop E. R., 88, 89, 98, 102, 142, 143, 151-154, 208-210.
Andrew, Bishop James O., 24, 25.
Anti-Slavery Journals, 21.
Anti-Slavery Societies, 19-21.
Arkansas Conference, 31.
Asbury, Francis, 16, 17.
Atlantic Conferences, 70-79.

B

Baker, Bishop, O. C., 88, 99, 142, 143, 150.
Baltimore Christian Advocate, 55, 114.
Baltimore Conference, 47, 49, 50.
Baptist Church—
  Slavery Contest in, 27, 42.
  Missions in South, 99.
  Periodicals, 129.
Bartine, D. W., 70.
Black River Conference, 76.
Boston Preachers' Meeting, 67, 68, 97, 137.
Butler, Gen. B. F., 96, 113, 169, 170.
"Butternuts," 86 and Note.

C

Calhoun, John C., 42.
Central Christian Advocate, 35, 36, 87, 121-125.
Central Ohio Conference, 82.
Chaplains—
  Laws regulating, 135, 136.
  Letter to Senator Wilson concerning, 134.
  Methodist, 138, 139.
  Names of Methodist, 188-195.
Christian Advocate and Journal, 23, 35, 39, 45, 59, 60, 61, 76, 114-117, 129, 130, 138.
Christian Apologist, 128, 131.
Cincinnati Conference, 81, 130, 131.
Clark, D. W., 132, 159.
Clay, Henry, 40.
Conferences, Early General, 16-24.
Conferences, General, 1844, 24-26; 1848, 34; 1856, 38; 1860, 39, 47, 112; 1864, 87-92.
Connecticut, 63.
Cookman, Alfred, 70.
"Copperheads," 86.
Crooks, Geo. R., 70, 72.
Cummings, Joseph, 88, 89.
Curry, Daniel, 72.

D

Delaware, 63.
Disciplines, Early, 17-19.
Douglas, Stephen A., 44.
Durbin, J. P., 36, 70.

E

East Baltimore Conference, 47, 48, 50-51.
East Genesee Conference, 76.
Eddy, T. A., 88, 125-127.
Elliott, Charles, 39, 87, 88, 89, 114-117.
Erie Conference, 76.

F

Fisk, Gen. Clinton B., 94.
  Mrs. Clinton B., 60.
Foster, R. S., 70, 88.
Freedmen, Organizations for aiding, 168-176.
Fremont, Gen. John C., 112, 113.
Fugitive Slave Bill, 41.

G

Garrison, William L., 19.
Genesee Conference, 75.
German Conferences, 80.
Gettysburg, 78.
Grant, U. S., 108, 150.

H

Harper's Weekly, 148, 157, 158.
Haven, E. O., 132.
Haven, Gilbert, 64, 137.
Hicks, Governor, 49, 51.

I

Indiana, 80, 86.
  Conferences in, 82, 83.
Illinois, 80.
  Conferences in, 83-85.
Iowa, 80, 86.
  Conferences in, 85.

J

Janes, Bishop E. S., 88, 99, 142, 144-146, 149.

K

Kansas—
  Struggle between Churches in, 29, 32-34.
  Conference, 87.
Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 44.
Kentucky, 56, 57.
  Conference (M. E.) 47, 48.
  M. E. Church, South, 57.
Kingsley, Charles, 88, 117-121, 132, 159.

L

Ladies' Repository, 128.
Liberator, The, 19.
Lincoln, A., 49, 89, 90, 91, 107, 108, 115, 133, 134.

Index.

M

Maine, 63.
McAnally, Dr., 59.
McClellan, Gen. Geo. B., 168.
McClintock, John, 70, 145-149.
McPheeters Case, 104-106.
Massachusetts, 63.
Maryland, 47, 49, 51.
Methodist, The, 111, 116 and Note.
Methodist Book Concern, 79.
Methodist Episcopal Church, South—
  Organization, 25, 26.
  Part in the War, 219-225.
  Oppose action of M. E. Church in South, 102-104.
Michigan, 80.
  Conference in, 85.
Minnesota, 80.
Missouri—
  Struggle between Churches in, 29, 30, 31, 58-62.
  Military Interference with Churches in, 104-108.
  Conference (M. E.), 47, 48.
Missionary Society, M. E. Church, 62, 100.
Moody, Granville, 81, 87, 88, 90.
Morris, Bishop Thomas A., 88, 142, 144.

N

Nashville and Louisville Christian Advocate, 45.
Newark Conference, 73, 74.
New England, 44, 63-69.
Negroes—
  Early attitude of Government towards, 168, 169.
  Employment of, by commanders, 169-171.
New Hampshire, 63.
New Jersey, 73.
  Conference, 74.
New Orleans, 96.
New York, 63.
  Conference, 72, 73.
  East Conference, 70-72.
Northern Christian Advocate, 35.
Northwestern Christian Advocate, 35, 36, 38, 125-127.
North Ohio Conference, 81.
Newman, John P., 70, 108, 159.

O

Odell, Hon. M. F., 71, 72.
Ohio, 80.

P

Pacific Christian Advocate, 128.
Paddock, G. W., 71, 87.
Peck, Jesse T., 88, 89.
Periodicals, Methodist, 111, 112, 128.
Periodicals M. E. Church, South, 128, 129.
Pennsylvania, 63, 77.
Philadelphia, 77, 78.
  Conference, 47, 48, 52, 53, 92.
Pittsburgh Conference, 76.
Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, 55, 76, 128.
Presbyterian Church—
  Slavery Contest in, 26, 27.
  Missions in South, 99.
Protestant Episcopal Church, 27.

R

Rhode Island, 63.

S

Scott, Bishop Levi, 48, 88, 142, 143, 150.
St. Louis Christian Advocate, 59.
Simpson, Bishop Matthew, 41, 88, 99, 142, 143, 154-159, 211-218.
Slavery Contest in the Church, 15-29.
Soldiers, Methodist, 92-95.
Stanton, Secretary E. M., 98, 152, 153, 155.
Stevens, Dr. Abel, 39, 70.

T

Texas—
  Struggle in the Church over Slavery, 31, 32.
Thomson, Edward, 39, 88, 114-117, 132, 159.
Tract Society, 131.
Troy Conference, 75.

U

Union Church, Philadelphia, 87.
United Presbyterian Church, 99.
United States Christian Commission, 149, 159, 161-166.
  List of Methodist preachers who were "delegates" in, 197-207.

V

Vermont, 63.
Virginia Conference, 17, 49.

W

Webster, Daniel, 41.
Wesley, John, 15, 16.
Wesleyan Methodist Church, 22, 23.
Western Christian Advocate, 35, 36, 39, 41, 79, 117-121, 138.
Whedon, D. D., 70.
West Virginia 53-55.
  Contest between Churches in, 29, 36, 40.
  Conference, 47, 48.
West Wisconsin Conference, 93.
Wisconsin, 80.
Wyoming Conference, 80.

Z

Zion's Herald, 34, 35, 44, 64, 65, 127, 128, 131.